

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA BULLETIN

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION



Issued Semi-Monthly By
THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
Norman, Oklahoma

New Series No. 250.

Extension No. 73.

November 15, 1922

325.73
S435r

UNIVERSITY
OF FLORIDA
LIBRARY



UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA BULLETIN

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION

QUESTION: .

RESOLVD. *That Immigration to the United States should be
further restricted.*



JOHN D. DODD
LIBRARY

A DEBATE BULLETIN
EDITED BY
JOSEPH WHITEFIELD SCROGGS
Assisted by Edith Perry and N. S. Stephenson

5435r

INTRODUCTION

Some years ago, Mr. Roosevelt denounced our present debating because it cultivated the mere desire to win regardless of truth or right. It is up to our debaters to prevent this denunciation from being just. High school debating is an educative activity. It matters very little who wins the decision of the judges; the real winner is the one who gains the greatest ability and skill in debating. The sole value of debating is developing ability to find out the truth about the subject debated.

Debate should develop broadmindedness. Some object to studying both sides* of a question. In real life people are prone to study only the side in which they are selfishly interested. They often deliberately try to misconceive and misrepresent the other side. This makes debate the servant of error instead of truth. This tendency is so strong in life that it needs to be combated in school life as a preparation.

The present subject is a difficult one for debate. Employers of labor generally oppose restriction of immigration, while labor leaders generally favor it. The reasons are very evident. Impartiality is not natural to us; we have to attain it by careful and conscientious effort, and debating such a question as this furnishes an excellent opportunity for such training. Note that the question is negative; the affirmative argues against immigration, the negative in favor of it.

Study both sides. No debater is qualified to debate such a question till he knows enough of the subject to debate either side of it. It is highly creditable to reach a decision in full view of the opposing arguments. But to decide in favor of either side without knowing and fairly considering the arguments on the other side of the question is not "decision" at all.

Debating is trying to find out the truth. Arguing to justify an opinion already formed is not debating at all; it is merely trying to justify prejudices, something which you never ought to have. Immigration is a great, a complicated and intricate question, and one which is very vital to our American life and to the present and future of our country. Go to it.

J. W. SCROGG'S

University of Oklahoma,
September, 1922

THE NEW IMMIGRATION LAW

The Monthly Labor Review, July, 1921.

The United States Congress passed "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States," which was approved by the President May 19, 1921. Section 5 of the act states that "this act shall take effect and be in force fifteen days after its enactment," exception being made of certain sections of the act which covered the preparation for its administration and which were to take effect immediately upon the enactment of the law. The approval of the act on May 19 made it effective, therefore, on June 3. By the act of Congress May 19, 1922, this act was extended to June 30, 1924. The act is as follows:

An Act to Limit the Immigration of Aliens Into the United States

As used in this Act—The term "United States" means the United States, and any waters, territory, or other place subject to the jurisdiction thereof except the Canal Zone and the Philippine Islands, but if any alien leaves the Canal Zone or any insular possession of the United States and attempts to enter any other place under the jurisdiction of the United States nothing contained in this act shall be construed as permitting him to enter under any other condition than those applicable to all aliens.

The word "alien" includes any person not a native-born or naturalized citizen of the United States, but this definition shall not be held to include Indians of the United States not tax nor citizens of the islands under the jurisdiction of the United States.

The term "Immigration Act" means the act of February 5, 1917, entitled "An Act to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States;" and the term "Immigration Laws" includes such act and all laws, conventions, and treaties of the United States relating to the immigration, exclusion, or expulsion of aliens.

SEC. 2. (a) THAT THE NUMBER OF ALIENS OF ANY NATIONALITY WHO MAY BE ADMITTED UNDER THE IMMIGRATION LAWS TO THE UNITED STATES IN ANY FISCAL YEAR SHALL BE LIMITED TO 3 PER CENTUM OF THE NUMBER OF FOREIGN-BORN PERSONS OF SUCH NATIONALITY RESIDENT IN THE UNITED STATES AS DETERMINED BY THE UNITED STATES CENSUS OF 1910. This provision shall not apply to the following, and they shall not be counted in reckoning any of the percentage limits provided in this act: (1) Government officials, their families, attendants, servants, and employees; (2) aliens in continuous transit thru the United States; (3) aliens lawfully admitted to the United States who later go in transit from one part of the United States to another thru foreign contiguous territory; (4) aliens visiting the United States as tourists or temporarily for

business or pleasure; (5) aliens from countries immigration from which is regulated in accordance with treaties or agreements relating solely to immigration; (6) aliens from the so-called Asiatic barred zone, as described in section 3 of the immigration act; (7) aliens who have resided continuously for at least one year immediately preceding the time of their admission to the United States in the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Republic of Cuba, the Republic of Mexico, countries of Central or South America, or adjacent islands; or (8) aliens under the age of 18 who are children of the United States.

(b) For the purposes of this act nationality shall be determined by the country of birth treating as separate countries the colonies or dependencies for which separate enumeration was made in the United States census of 1910.

(c) The Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor, jointly, shall, as soon as feasible after the enactment of this act, prepare a statement showing the number of persons of the various nationalities resident in the United States as determined by the United States census of 1910, which statement shall be the population basis for the purposes of this act. In case of changes in political boundaries in foreign countries occurring subsequent to 1910 and resulting (1) in the creation of new countries, the Governments of which are recognized by the United States, or (2) in the new transfer of territory from one country to another, such transfer being recognized by the United States, said officials, jointly, shall estimate the number of persons resident in the United States, in 1910 who were born within the area included in such new countries and in such territory so transferred, and revise the population basis as to each country involved in such change of political boundary. For the purpose of such revision and for the purposes of this act generally aliens born in the area included in any such new country shall be considered as having been born in the country, and aliens born in any territory so transferred shall be considered as having been born in the country to which such territory was transferred.

(d) When the maximum number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted in any fiscal year under this act shall have been admitted all other aliens of such nationality except as otherwise provided in this act, who may apply for admission during the same fiscal year shall be excluded: Provided, That the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted in any month shall not exceed 20 per centum of the total number of aliens of such nationality who are admissible in that fiscal year. Provided further: That aliens returning from a temporary visit abroad, aliens who are professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, nurses, ministers of any religious denomination, professors for colleges or seminaries, aliens belonging to any recognized learned profession, or aliens employed as domestic servants, may, if otherwise admissible, be admitted notwithstanding the maximum number of aliens of the same nationality admissible in the same month or fiscal year, as the case may be, shall have entered the United States; but aliens of the classes included in this proviso who enter the United States before such maximum number shall have entered shall (unless

excluded by subdivision (a) from being counted) be counted in reckoning the percentage limits provided in this act; Provided further, That in the enforcement of this act preference shall be given so far as possible to the wives, parents, brothers, sisters, children under 18 years of age, and fiancées, (1) of citizens of the United States, (2) of aliens now in the United States who have applied for citizenship in the manner provided by law, or (3) of persons eligible to United States citizenship who served in the military or naval forces of the United States at any time between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, both dates inclusive, and have been separated from such forces under honorable conditions.

SEC. 3. That the Commissioner General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, shall, as soon as feasible after the enactment of this act, and from time to time thereafter, prescribe rules and regulations necessary to carry the provisions of this act into effect. He shall, as soon as feasible after the enactment of this act publish a statement showing the number of aliens of the various nationalities who may be admitted to the United States between the date of this act becomes effective and the end of the current fiscal year, and on June 30 thereafter he shall publish a statement showing the number of aliens of the various nationalities who may be admitted during the ensuing fiscal year. He shall also publish monthly statements during the time this act remains in force showing the number of aliens of each nationality already admitted during the current fiscal year and the number who may be admitted under the provisions of this act during the remainder of such year, but when 75 per centum of the maximum number of any nationality admissible during the fiscal year shall have been admitted such statements shall be issued weekly thereafter. All statements shall be made available for general publication and shall be mailed to all transportation companies bringing aliens to the United States who shall request the same and shall file with the Department of Labor the address to which such statements shall be sent. The Secretary of Labor shall also submit such statements to the Secretary of State, who shall transmit the information contained therein to the proper diplomatic and consular officials of the United States, which officials shall make the same available to persons intending to emigrate to the United States and to others who may apply.

SEC. 4. That the provisions of this act are in addition to and not in substitution for the provisions of the immigration laws.

SEC. 5. That this act shall take effect and be enforced 15 days after its enactment except sections 1 and 3 and subdivisions (b) and (c) of section 2, which shall take effect immediately upon the enactment of this act, and shall continue in force until June 30, 1922, and the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted during the remaining period of the current fiscal year, from the date when this act becomes effective to June 30, shall be limited in proportion to the number admissible during the fiscal year 1922.

Approved, May 19, 1921.

Notes

It will be noted that the number of aliens of any nationality

is limited during any fiscal year to 3 per cent of the number of foreign-born persons of such nationality in the United States as determined by the census of 1910, and the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor are instructed jointly to prepare a statement showing the number of persons resident in the United States in 1910 of the various nationalities covered by the act and upon which the quota for each country should be calculated. The committee appointed by the above named secretaries to assist in carrying out the provision of this law were:

On the part of Secretary of State, H. A. McBride, chief of visa section, Department of State, and Maj. Lawrence Martin, Division of Western European Affairs;

On the part of the Secretary of Commerce, William C. Hunt, chief statistician for population of the Census, and Joseph A. Hill, chief statistician for review and results of the census, since appointed by President Harding as Assistant Director of the Census.

On the part of the Secretary of Labor, W. W. Husband, Commissioner-General of Immigration, and Ethelbert Stewart, Commissioner of Labor Statistics.

The report of that committee, as approved by the secretaries of the three departments named in the law, allocated the quota of immigrants that may be received from each country from June 3, the date the law became effective, to June 1, 1921. As the law permits a limit of 20% of the annual quota to be admitted in any one month until the quota is exhausted, a third column was added showing this limit of permissible immigration from each country in any one month. The table showing the number of aliens admissible under the act from each designated country or place of birth is shown below.

**Number of Aliens Admissible Under the Immigration Act of
May 19, 1921**

COUNTRY OR PLACE OF BIRTH	Quota June 3 to 30, 1921	Quota, fiscal year 1921-22	Limit in any one month, fiscal year 1921-22
Albania -----	22	287	57
Austria -----	571	7,444	1,489
Belgium -----	119	1,557	311
Bulgaria -----	23	301	60
Czechoslovakia -----	1,095	14,269	2,854
Danzig -----	22	285	57

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION

7

Denmark -----	433	5,644	1,129
Finland -----	298	3,890	778
Fiume -----	5	71	14
France -----	437	5,692	1,138
Germany -----	5,219	68,039	13,608
Greece -----	252	3,286	657
Hungary -----	432	5,635	1,127
Italy -----	3,224	42,021	8,404
Jugoslavia -----	491	6,405	1,281
Luxemburg -----	7	92	18
Netherlands -----	276	3,602	720
Norway -----	930	12,116	2,423
Iceland -----	1,528	20,019	4,004
Eastern Galicia -----	451	5,781	1,156
Portugal (including Azores and Madeira Island) -----	177	2,689	454
Russia (including Siberia) -----	2,627	34,247	6,849
Spain -----	51	633	133
Sweden -----	1,531	19,956	3,991
Switzerland -----	287	3,745	749
United Kingdom -----	5,923	77,205	15,441
Other Europe (including Andorra, Gibraltar, Lichtenstein, Malta, Monaco, San Marino, Iceland) --	6	86	17
Armenia -----	122	1,598	318
Palestine -----	4	56	11
Smyrna District -----	34	438	88
Syria -----	69	905	181
Other Turkey (Europe and Asia) --	16	215	43
Other Asia (including Persia and territory other than Siberia which is not in- cluded in the Russia quota ---	6	78	16
Africa -----	9	120	24
Australia -----	21	271	54
New Zealand -----	4	50	10
Atlantic Islands (other than Azores, Madeira, and islands adjacent to the American Continents -----	5	60	12
Pacific Islands (other than New Zealand and islands adjacent to the American Continent -----	2	22	4
TOTAL -----	27,298	355,825	71,163

It will be noted that this act restricts the number of possible immigrants in the United States for the next two years to 355,825 per year. Of those not more than 71,163 may be admitted during any one month.

THREE PER CENT**Some Human Factors in the Immigration Problem**

By VIOLA I. PARADISE

Harper's Magazine, March, 1922

Should they admit or deport him? Ellis Island considered the case of an ex-official of Monrovia, Liberia. The month's quota for his country was all but exhausted; an allotment of one-half of one person remained. The official could not successfully be cut in half; he conformed in other respects to the requirements of our immigration laws; and so, after deliberation, it was decided that he be admitted, the remaining half of him to be charged to the following month's quota.

For, since the passage of our latest immigration law, arithmetic plays the leading role in the continuous drama at Ellis Island and other ports. The law limits the number of newcomers of any nationality to 3 per cent of the number of foreigners of that nationality in this country, according to the census of 1910. And of these admissible 3 per cent, no more than one-fifth may enter in a single month. Thus of 5,692 admissible French, 1,138 may enter in one month; of the 68,039 Germans, 13,608 may enter in one month; of 3,286 Greeks, 657 may enter in a single month; and so on, for each nationality, until the year's quota is exhausted. Some countries will exhaust their quota within five months. Others—Great Britain, for example—will use up neither the monthly nor the year's quota.

How does the law work out? Can it be enforced fairly, without excessive hardship to the immigrant? It is a restrictive measure? Is it also, as it aims to be, in any way selective? What problems of administration does it create? Just what happens to immigrants applying for admission to the United States since the passage of this law? Is it a case of "first come first served?"

To begin with the last question, nothing so simple as "first come first served" applies to the enforcement of this law. If you are a Greek, for example, and arrive on August 31, your chance of admission is poorer than if you came on September 1; and your chance, if you arrive on September 2, is poorer than if you had waited to reach these shores until October 1. For in some instances a country's quota is exhausted within the first few hours of the first day of the month. As a result, ships carrying immigrants from small-quota countries lie just outside the harbor, if they arrive before the first of the month, and then, on the stroke of midnight, dash to quarantine. The ship that wins the race has the privilege of landing its immigrants first. Thus at mid-

night of August 31 some half dozen ships steamed at full speed to quarantine in the New York harbor. A single minute would make a tremendous difference in the lives of hundreds of immigrants who had pulled up stakes in the old country, had used the savings of years to buy their tickets, had broken old ties, and who, if deported, would be stranded penniless at a European port, faced with untold hardship and distress. Surely no other race in history was run for such tremendous stakes. One boat reaches quarantine at 1 a. m. Its human cargo is safe unless, perchance, at some other port in the United States another immigrant-bearing vessel arrived a minute, or a fraction of a minute, earlier. Another ship arrives at 1:09 a. m. Its passengers—if the law is enforced—are doomed to deportation, while others of their countrymen, who set out perhaps a month later, and who happen to be on the lucky boat, which the following month first reaches quarantine, will be admitted.

"But," it may be asked, "how does it happen that the steamship companies, which must carry the deported immigrants back to the port of embarkation free of charge, take the risk of bringing immigrants here in excess of the numbers admissible?"

The steamship companies have no way of knowing how many passengers other steamship companies are carrying, either to the port for which their boats are bound or to other ports. At present, about seventy-five steamship companies are sending ships from, roughly, a hundred foreign ports to forty-seven ports of entry into the United States. Moreover, even if a steamship company had the figures for other companies, it could always gamble on the chance of beating other ships to quarantine.

"Is there no danger in such racing to port? I asked the representative of one company.

"Considerable danger," he said, "It's safe enough on a clear night, but in a fog anything might happen"—involving not only immigrants, but even the innocent passengers of the cabin.

How many immigrants have been deported as a result of the law? At the time of writing (September 10) no statistics on the number of deportations since July 1 are available at Ellis Island or in Washington. The Acting Secretary of Labor stated that he had within the last few days signed hundreds of deportation orders under the quota law. In the month of June only one single immigrant was actually deported for exceeding the quota. At the time this law was passed many immigrants were already on the high seas, and the unlimited trouble which would result by the immediate enforcement of the measure led Congress to pass a public resolution providing for the admission of any immigrants on vessels which had departed from foreign ports on or before June 8.

if otherwise admissible, even tho the June quota was full. (Immigrats so admitted were to be charged to the quota for the year beginning July 1, but not to July's quota.)

Not only does an immigrant's luck in happening to land at a propitious moment determine his acceptability to us under this measure; there is also a dash of luck in regard to his nationality. The law is not based on his race, but on the political identity of his country at the time he was born. (An exception to this is made in the case of transferd territory or the creation of a new country recognized by the United States. Thus a native of Alsace-Lorraine, whatever nationality he claims, is charged to France; a native of what is now known as Poland is not charged to that country, but is considerd a native of an unrecognized Baltic state, formerly a part of Russia.) A case typical of many was that of three girls, cousins, born in the same village which had belongd to Bulgaria when two of them were born, to Greece at the birth of the third. The Bulgarian quota happend not to be full at the time the ship on which these girls saild reacht quarantine, but the Greek quota was exhausted. The two so-called Bulgarians were admitted. The The so-cald Greek girl was deported.

Still another instance is in point. A Scotchman and his wife emigrated to Africa, where their child was born. When the boy was fourteen years old, both parents died. A well-to-do kinsman, in America, able and eager to give the boy a good home and education, went to Africa to get him and bring him to America. When they reacht our shores the African quota for the month happend to be exhausted. If the boy had been born a little earlier before his parents had moved to Africa, he could have been brought in under the quota for the United Kingdom, which is never filld. But he was born in Africa, and was therefore excluded at the port. The uncle, however, appeald the case to the Secretary of Labor at Washington, who found a loophole under which to admit the child. The law makes certain exceptions. Students, for example, are allowd to enter. Every law admits of interpretation. Since this child was to be educated here, he was admitted as a student.

During July and August the Department of Labor made certain more general exceptions to the strict enforcement of the law, in various respects, in order to avoid inflicting the anguish which which strict enforcement would entail. "Temporary entry into the United States" was permitted in August to wives coming to husbands, aged and deperdent parents coming to children, children under eighteen coming to one or both parents, and sisters coming to brothers who had servd in the World War—provided, in every

case, that the relative to whom the immigrant was "destind" was able and willing to support the newcomer. Such temporary entries were to be charged to later quotas, the temporarily admitted immigrants meanwhile being considered travelers—also an excepted class.

This, however, was a temporary measure only. No similar regulation was made for September, and the general impression was current that the practice was to be discontinued. Whether or not it is immediately given up, it must perforce eventually be stopt, for the annual quota for certain nationalities would very quickly be filld, and as soon as this happens all immigration from such countries will be cut off. A generous interpretation of the law may temporarily mitigate the anguish of a limitd number of families, but there is no way in which the annual quota may legally be exceeded, no matter what misery may result.

Has the quota law affected the quality of immigration in any way? An attempt was made to learn the number of aliens deported for specific causes, and to compare the proportion of idiots, imbeciles, and other deportable classes, with the proportion of the same classes deported before the passage of the quota law. No such statistics have at present writing been compiled by the Bureau of Immigration. It was the general opinion, exprest by the Commissioner at Ellis Island, physicians, inspectors, and interpreters on the Island—practically all of whom are firm believers in the restriction of immigration—that the law had in no way affected the quality of immigration, altho, of course, it had greatly reduced the numbers. It would seem that steamship companies, since they may land far fewer persons than formerly, would select only the very strongest and safest immigrants. Evidently, however, the previous laws (which still stand) which exclude every conceivable class of "undesirable aliens," had been sufficient to make the companies exercise their maximum of care.

The quota law, as it works out, surely cannot be calld selective, despite the nationality percentage provision, which was framed with the intention of restricting immigration from the south and east of Europe, while allowing it freely from the north and west. It should be noted that the law does not actually permit the admission of 3 per cent of the aliens now in this country, but 3 per cent of those here eleven years ago, for the 1910, not the 1920, census is used as the basis of population. The law in no way stimulates English, Irish, Scandinavian, and other immigration from the north and west of Europe, which has been fallling off for years. The nationality clause merely acts as a further limitation on numbers. Examine the list of countries with their quotas

admissible for the fiscal year 1921-22. (See Immigration Act: first article.)

The United Kingdom has not since 1914 contributed any thing like her present quota; nor has Germany or Sweden contributed even an approach to their respective quotas within recent years. The result of the law will be that, instead of the 355,825 which the law permits to enter the United States, a smaller number will come.

Meanwhile, of course, the enforcement of our other immigration laws goes on.

The procedure of handling immigrants is familiar to many, but perhaps a brief restatement should be made. From quarantine the steamships go to the dock, where cabin passengers are landed, and where the immigrants are transferred to barges, which take them to Ellis Island. Here their first experience is examination by physicians of the Public Health Service. One physician makes a general cursory survey of the newcomer, perhaps asks him a question or two. If there is any suspicion of physical or mental inferiority, the immigrant is marked for a more careful examination. A second physician examines every scalp for favus or ring worm, turns back every eyelid for traces of trachoma. He, too, puts his mark on all doubtful cases.

The immigrant who has already been examined many times—at the port of embarkation, on shipboard, and at quarantine—is so accustomed to the process that he takes it as a matter of fact. Even the little children do not cry, but merely blink as their eyelids are turned back. However, when marked immigrants are led into a special room for a thorough physical and sometimes mental examination then, perhaps, there are tears. A child taken without its mother may be frightened; or an adult, separated from the main stream, becomes anxious and nervous, and the fear of deportation, never wholly absent, waxes strong.

The immigrants who are passed by the physicians, and later those who have been examined and tagged to indicate the doctor's diagnosis, proceed upstairs into the aisles of the large inspection hall. At the end of each aisle are an inspector, an interpreter, and sometimes a guard.

I stand next to an inspector as he checks up the "manifest sheets," and questions immigrant after immigrant. First comes a Hungarian, twenty years old, round-faced, and confident, with ticket to Chicago, fifty dollars, and an affidavit from a prosperous uncle who promises to provide for him. He has already satisfied the doctors that he is not an idiot or imbecile; that he is not feeble-minded, insane, epileptic, tubercular, afflicted with a loathsome or contagious disease, and that he has no constitutional psychopathic inferiority, or other mental or physical defect which could affect his ability to earn a living. He now satisfies the inspector that his

passport and visa are genuine; that, among other things, he is not a pauper, a vagrant, stowaway, polygamist, criminal, anarchist, or person who believes in the overthrow by force or violence of the government of the United States; that he is not a contract laborer; that his passage has not been paid for by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign government;" that he is not likely to become a public charge; that he is not illiterate. He takes the test book, with its forty words transcribed from the Bible, and begins reading with gusto. He seems almost disappointed that the inspector, convinced after the first few words of his ability to read, does not push the test to its conclusion. He is admitted, the quota for his country not being exhausted, and passes down to the railroad room.

After him comes a man of thirty-seven with his nephew of nine.

"You are Greek?" asks the inspector, examining his Greek passport.

"No, I am Albanian."

"Your passport is Greek."

The man answers in English. He has lived in the United States for several years. "When I born my village Greek. Now Albanian."

"You're Greek," says the inspector, "Don't try to pull any of that bull. Where's the boy's passport?"

The boy also has a Greek passport, altho when he was born the village belonged to Turkey. He is coming to his father in Boston. They are questiond further, and then are both given yellow cards, meaning that they are held for "Special inquiry."

The inspector turns to me. "They know the Greek quota is exhausted, and try to pretend they are Albanian."

"What will happen to them?" I ask.

"Oh, the board will probably admit the boy, if his father provides bond. The Turkish quota is not yet exhausted. But the uncle will be deported."

"Won't the fact that he has been in America before, that he has money, and was able to save enough to go back to Greece, and is obviously capable of supporting himself—won't these facts help him?"

"No, he's been away longer than six months, and so has forfeited his exemption under the quota law; the quota's filld, so back he'll go." He turns to the next case.

Again it is a Greek, twenty-one years old, a wheelwright by trade. He too receives a yellow card. After him comes others. Every Greek from now to the beginning of the next month will run

foul of the full quota; and within a few days quotas for several other countries will probably be filled.

I pass to the next inspector's desk. An Armenian boy of nine with an old little face is the first applicant. He has traveled all the way from Armenia, alone. He answers the inspector's questions intelligently, but almost with detachment. He is a child only in years. His large brown eyes meet the inspector's frankly for a moment, then turn absently toward the window. It is as if he has seen so much of sorrow that he has no emotion left to give to this present crisis in his life. The inspector, as he writes out the yellow card, says to me: "He'll doubtless be admitted on bond. His father has sent a good affidavit." I smile encouragingly at the boy, who has now turned half-attentive eyes on me. He nods, in recognition of the smile, but does not smile back. Has he even known how, I wonder and will he learn again?

Next comes a Mennonite, a Russian German, rather short and chubby. He wears a tan Russian blouse and high boots. He says that he is one of sixty-two Mennonites who have come on money provided by a Mennonite society in Kansas. The society will provide them with tickets to Kansas, where they expect to farm. Under the law they are deportable, as "assisted immigrants," but the loophole of religious persecution will probably let them in—they were conscientious objectors; it was against their religion to carry arms, and they "had trouble with the government at home." The Russian quota is large, and there will be no difficulty on that score.

The next applicant is an old Jew from Palestine. He wears a long coat, and pulls nervously at his white beard. The physician has certified him as having defective vision. He takes his yellow card with trembling hand. He stops to tell the inspector that his son in America is rich. The guard hurries him on, to a Special Inquiry room.

It is with difficulty that I tear myself away from the inspection hall, with its picturesque crowd of eager faces, some glowing with excitement and hope, others tense with apprehension. I should like to wait until the group of rosy-cheeked Slovak peasant girls—with their red-figured kerchiefs about their heads, and tied under their chins, their white blouses with big sleeves, embroidered in red-and-blue cross-stitch—reaches the inspectors desk; or for the Italian mother, in a dress of bright, bluish-green, proudly carrying a baby tied gayly on a white pillow with a bow of pink ribbon; or for another Italian family, a mother and father, with four tiny children all dressed in figured scarlet calico. It is a colorful room.

and an eager. Is there any other place in the world, I wonder, where so many people are gathered together, all having torn themselves up by the roots, from their homes, coming not to visit, but to live in a country whose language and customs are foreign to them?

Next I go into one of the Special Inquiry rooms, where the doubtful cases are sent for consideration by the boards. It is only by special privilege that I am allowed in these rooms, for the hearings of the Special Inquiry boards are secret; the public is not allowed. There is no jury. The cases are heard by three inspectors, appointed from among the inspectors on the Island, who have the power of deciding whether to admit or to exclude. To be sure, the immigrant has the right of appealing—except in certain cases (see below) to the Secretary of Labor at Washington, who in many instances has the power to reverse the board's decision; and when the immigrant or one of his relatives already in the United States happens to understand this right, or when some immigrant-helping society learns of his case and undertakes to make the appeal for him the adverse decision of the board may possibly be reversed.

During the last fiscal year for which statistics are available (ending June 30, 1920), 11,795 persons were rejected at the ports of entry. Of these only 4,812 availed themselves of their right to appeal, and in 1,862 cases the opinions of the board were reversed. These facts may suggest the power that is wielded by the immigration inspector—probably a greater power of meeting out happiness or misery than that of any other Federal officer. He makes decisions which have more far-reaching effects upon the lives of human beings than that of a judge in our courts, passing prison sentence. Imagine the wisdom needed to decide fairly, for example, whether the immigrant is "likely to become a public charge"—the reason for which more immigrants are deported than for any other.

What are the qualifications of the men who fill these important positions? How are they selected?

They take a Civil Service examination, which tests their memory of the immigration laws—an examination of the same general type as a policeman's. They are paid salaries ranging from 1,380 to 2,100 a year. Equipped with a familiarity with the law, the departmental instructions, and what individual endowments they happen to possess—which, fortunately, may include some human understanding, even tho the examination does not demand this quality—they sit and pass judgment. "Every day is judgment day at Ellis

Island," said the Commissioner there. "The watchword I have sent out is, 'When in doubt, deport!'"

But to return to the Special Inquiry room. I am permitted to sit at the table with the three inspectors, the interpreter, and the stenographer. Eight or ten immigrants wait their turn, on benches facing the table. They go thru the ordeal alone, their American relations not being allowed in the room while they are being questioned. At present a young Jewish couple, the man nineteen, the woman twenty, are being considered. On primary inspection they were certified as "likely to become a public charge," not because of any mental or physical defect, but because the inspector thought they might have difficulty in finding work, and because of their youth.

"Is the man's brother here?" asks the board chairman. A guard goes to the witness room and returns with a dapper, prosperous man, in a well-fitting palm-beach suit. He has been in America for many years. He states that he has \$22,000 invested in his business, has \$1,500 in the bank; that he will look after his brother and sister-in-law, will see that the man learns English, and will in time employ him in his store. After some hesitation the board admits the couple.

Next comes a Greek seamstress thirty-seven years old. She happens to be among the first Greeks to land this month and therefore is not excludable under the quota law. She is "destined" to her father. Attractive, well dressed, she obviously makes a good impression on the board. But, unfortunately, she is illiterate. They hand her a book, and ask her to read. She begins to tremble, turns white. She points a shaking finger at the letters. "Epsilon," she mutters, and repeats the letter. It is evidently the only one she can recognize.

The board questions her. "Where is the rest of your family?" They had been killed by the Turks. She herself had escaped to Constantinople, and worked in a French family as housemaid. Possibly she still had one brother in the Turkish army. She had not had positive news of his death, but neither had she heard from him in three years. She had mourned him for dead.

If she returned to Turkey would she work again for the French family?

No; they had gone back to France. She had no one in Turkey.

"While in Constantinople did you experience any religious persecution?"

No, she shakes her head.

They let her try to read again and again she fails utterly. If she were coming to escape religious persecution, if she had been married, and were coming to a husband, or if she were under sixteen years of age, the literacy provisions of the law would not have kept her out.

It is explained that, in case of deportation, the money she paid for her ticket will be refunded to her. "Where do you want the money sent?"

She is dazed, cannot answer. The interpreter, amazed at her failure to reply, repeats the question impatiently. She shrugs her shoulders; she has no place to go, can give no address. Her only living relative, her father—is in America.

She is ordered deported. She goes back to her seat, drops her face in her hands, and cries silently.

"You understand you have the right of appeal to the Secretary of Labor?" she is asked.

She does not answer. Evidently the statement means nothing to her. It is repeated. Again she does not answer. Then the interpreter, impatient, shouts it at her, asks her if she understands.

"Yes, yes," she says; and this goes into the record, tho it is obvious that she does not understand. Presently a guard comes and takes her to the detention quarters, where she will await deportation.

The next case is also Greek. An illiterate woman, "destind" to her husband in Chicago, has neither money nor ticket. The board asks her a few questions to assure themselves that she is really the wife of the man she claims as her husband. "What day of the week were you married?" And again, "When you were married, did you and your husband set up housekeeping for yourselves, or did you live with his family or your family?" The answers reassure the board, and a telegram is sent to the husband (in her name) asking for an affidavit and money. The case is deferred, pending his reply.

Next a German woman from Jugo-Slavia, with her fifteen-year-old son. The board is evidently as much impressed with the boy's successful full-grown mustache as is the boy himself. They are coming to the woman's daughter and son-in-law. The affidavits are satisfactory; they are admitted.

Another Greek case—this time a romantic one. Her name is Penelope; she is shy and attractive. She is coming to her intended husband, who works in a restaurant in New Haven. She is questioned. Yes, she has known him since childhood. (An inspector turns to me to explain that many Greek women have

been coming recently to marry men they have never seen.) She is told to sit down. A guard goes to the witness room and comes back with the man. He is beaming with anticipation; he has no doubts as to the outcome. He has been in America a year, speaks English fluently.

"Why are you here?" he is asked.

"I'm engaged with 'a girl."

He is making \$30 a week, has saved \$600, has bought \$450 worth of furniture, and has taken and furnished an apartment.

The girl is called. "Is this the man?" she is asked. She blushes, nods. He reaches out his hand, and gives her hand a secret hasty shake.

"When are you planning to get married?" she is asked.

She looks down. It is not for a well-mannered Greek girl to say. Her fiancé speaks up. "In two weeks."

"Would you be willing to marry her today? Right now?"

He assents. "By all means!"

She looks hastily, deprecatingly, down at her dress, but is willing. She is admitted, in care of the Y. W. C. A., which is entrusted with the task of getting the license, and seeing that the marriage is performed.

"The big church wedding they'll have after they get home," an inspector informs me.

And so on, case after case. Now the decision is favorable, there is large happy ending; again it is unfavorable, there is tragedy.

"It is a terrible thing to see a boatload of immigrants about to be deported," said the Commissioner at Ellis Island. "No one can ever picture the scenes of anguish we see at this port. Sometimes we have to carry people on board hysterical, shrieking, threatening to jump overboard. Only recently we had difficulty in keeping two women from throwing their babies overboard. They said death was preferable to the lives these children would have to lead back in their old country."

Threats of suicide are, of course, more frequent than the act itself. Yet suicides as a result of deportation are by no means unknown. At the Department of Labor in Washington I was told of two deported stowaways, one sixteen and the other seventeen years of age, who jumped overboard, and were drowned.

Another very different story of a stowaway was cited. A seventeen-year-old boy had crossed the Alps, had walked all the way across Germany, and had shipped as a stowaway from Marseilles. He stayed down in the hold for four days, when hunger drove

him up. He was deported from Ellis Island. Some months later, again a stowaway, he applied for admission at New Orleans, and was again deported, the law in regard to stowaways being very strict.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, 13,779 immigrants were debard. Of these by far the largest number deported for any one cause were the 5,872 who, for one reason or another—but not because of any mental or physical defect—were considered by the inspectors as likely to become public charges. The next largest group were the stowaways, of whom 2,291 were excluded; 1441 illiterates were third in the list, 993 contract laborers were fourth, and 856 persons afflicted with loathsome or dangerous contagious diseases (including tuberculosis, trachoma, favus, and others) were fifth. The sixth group were the 620 persons with other physical defects, which it was believed might affect their ability to earn a living. Among the thirty-one other classifications were 200 children under sixteen years of age, unaccompanied by either parent, 88 who were excluded under the passport provision, 204 who were idiots, insane (or had been insane), imbeciles, feeble-minded, or epileptic; 178 criminals, 81 prostitutes and aliens coming for any immoral purpose, and 16 polygamists.

As has been said, the immigrant rejected by the Board of Special Inquiry has the right of appeal, unless he belongs to one of the classes to which the law does not allow this right. Thus, criminals, prostitutes, persons certified by physicians of the Public Health Service to be idiots, imbeciles, insane, persons with loathsome or dangerous contagious diseases, are among those who may not appeal. Others, however,—such, for example, as those who are judged likely to become a public charge—may appeal, if they understand their privilege, or if they have relatives or friends who understand and help them to exercise it. Certain nationalities have organizations equipt to assist their countrymen to make use of their rights under the law. Thus, the right of the immigrant to enter this country often depends not on the intrinsic merits of his case, but on the fact that pressure is brought to bear at Washington. Three immigrants with exactly the same claim may apply for admission to the United States. One, not realizing his right of appeal, does nothing and is deported. A second asks that his case be appealed, and the minutes of the hearing are sent to Washington, in which event the Secretary may or may not reverse the board's decision. The third secures the help of an immigrant aid society, which knows the law, which looks up the alien's relatives in America, finds out what they will do for him, and

sends an effective statement of the facts to Washington. The Secretary's decision may still be adverse, but there is no doubt that the chance of the third immigrant is far better than that of either of the others.

Perhaps the most tragic situations which arise are those involving a separation of families. A typical case is that of a mother, coming with four children to her husband, who has preceded her to America, with his two oldest sons, who has established a home here, and has sent for the rest of his family. At Ellis Island one of the children is certified by the examining physicians as feeble-minded, and must be deported. Some member of the family must return with this child, who can never be admitted to this country. Tragedy is inevitable. Shall the father and older boys give up the comfortable home they have established for the family here in America and go back with them to certain poverty and misery at home? Or shall the mother be sent back to leave the helpless child in the care of some stranger and return to give her other children the advantages which America offers?

Sometimes, in similar cases, but where the affliction is nothing as incurable as a mental defect—as, for example, a light case of trachoma which the physicians think would respond quickly to treatment—the Department at Washington has allowed a child to be treated in the hospital at Ellis Island, if the family pays the expense. In such cases one adult member of the family is also usually detained at Ellis Island, or occasionally admitted on bond, so that, if the family stops paying, or if the child is not, after all, curable, there will be some one to accompany him when he is deported.

It happened, during the war, that, because of the terrible suffering which would result from deportation, some excludable immigrants were admitted temporarily, on bond, to be deported as soon as the government decided a return passage was safe. Among these was a child, certified as feeble-minded. He was sent to school during his stay in America. When the time for his deportation approached his family protested that he was not feeble-minded. The principal of his school and his teacher filed statements that his work was above the average; that he frequently got "100" in arithmetic, for example. However, the decisions of the examining psychiatrists at the ports are final; there is under the law no appeal from them, even tho any number of outside alienists should disagree. The alienist in charge of the mental examinations, when interviewed about such cases as the above one, stated that they were very unusual and that, tho the relatives of mentally

defective or insane immigrants were allowed to bring in outside alienists, it seldom happened that such physicians disagreed with the diagnosis of those at the Ellis Island. When there is disagreement, however, the original diagnosis stands, and the immigrant is deported.

Often the cause of deportation is quite incomprehensible to the immigrant. How to explain the intricacies of the quota law in such a way as to make a deported peasant understand? How convince an alien, who, in good faith, paid for a visa, believing it to be genuine, that he is rejected because back home some one imposed upon him, and sold him a fraudulent visa? How persuade such a man that the lack of an American consul's signature—which is granted as a matter of routine to almost any applicant upon the payment of a fee—is the sole reason why he is not acceptable to America? Can it be that in future international relations the experience of these dazed, rejected people, for a cause very few of them could understand, and none could see as just, will affect the point of view of their own countries and the attitude of these countries toward America?

This article attempts merely to put before the reader a brief picture of how the application of our present immigration laws works out. The picture is by no means complete—a single paper is too small a canvas for it. The policy of restricting immigration is not considered. If Congress wants restriction, restriction it will have. The writer does wish to suggest, however, that the quota law is, in its working out, neither humane or logical; that in all deportation cases some less haphazard way be devised to mete out justice; that the secrecy of the Special Inquiry hearings be abolished; and that, in every important case—in fact, in every deportation case until a workable policy has been found—publicity be given to the decisions handed down. Plenty of precedent for such procedure is to be found in the Department of Agriculture, in the enforcement, for example, of the Food and Drug Act, in which enforcement each decision is not only made available to the public, but considered a matter of public concern. A decision as to how our immigration laws are being enforced is of no less value, and it is of great importance that the country at large should have available whatever information there is about this subject. This material concerning the addition to our population, so stimulating, so humanly interesting, could not help but increase the wisdom with which the nation will handle its immigration policies in the future.

THE THREATENED INUNDATION FROM EUROPE

The Literary Digest, December 18, 1920

Something more like panic than enthusiasm is manifested by our growing army of idle workers, which already numbers 2,000,000, according to the American Federation of Labor, over the promise of vast reenforcements from the war-broken countries of Europe. Thru its leaders it entreats Congress to put a two-year ban on all immigration, and insists that "no other question of such vital importance to the workers" as is that of protection from "the menace of excess immigration." At least four measures are pending in Congress to deal with this problem, and they take on an emergency character in view of the fact that the Passport Law, at present our most effective check on incoming aliens, expires on March 4. Nor is labor, we gather from the news and editorial columns of the daily press, the only element of the community that sees cause for alarm in recent official announcements that "at this minute all records (of immigration) are being broken" and that behind the men and women now crowding thru our gates at the rate of 125,000 a month are countless others—estimates range from 15,000,000 to 25,000,000—either clamoring for immediate passage or planning to leave their native lands at the earliest opportunity. Mr. Frank A. Vanderlip, an American banker whose interests are international, warns us that unless this new wave of immigration from desolated Europe is stopt or controld, it will hurt both industry and labor, reduce wages, and lower our standard of living. In addition to citing our already existing unemployment problem as a reason for checking the inrush of foreigners, many editorial observers warn us that a considerable number of the newcomers are revolutionary radicals who add to the ominous forces of social unrest; that the United States has reached a "point of saturation" where it can not properly assimilate the foreign element already here; and that failure to recognize this fact may result in the loss of the "American type."

Others, however, deny or minimize all these alleged dangers, arguing that virtually every immigrant produces more than he consumes, and is, therefore, an asset rather than a liability; that instead of a labor surplus in this country we have an actual shortage of "cheap" or unskild labor, the result of the stopping of all immigration during the war; that the farms, particularly, need such labor if they are to do their part in building up national prosperity; and that, as the New York Herald summarizes this point of view, "when we contemplate barring out immigration altogether, we contemplate economic suicide."

Before examining further into the conflicting views of the immigration problem and the proposed solutions, it will be worth while to glance at some of the facts that force this problem upon the attention of the public and of Congress at this time. "Emigration from Europe to the United States in the next few years will be limited only by the availability of shipping facilities or restrictive legislation," declares Dr. Rupert Blue, who is in charge of the medical examination of emigrants by American doctors in all the principal European ports and he says that the doctors' reports "show reservations which extend over a period of several years." This migration, he explains, is due mainly to misery in the home districts of the immigrants. United States Commissioner-General of Immigration, Anthony Caminetti who is studying the problem at its source in Europe, is quoted by a London correspondent as saying that approximately 25,000,000 Europeans desire to emigrate. The transatlantic steamship companies tell Mr. Frederick A. Wallis, Commissioner of Immigration at Ellis Island, that 15,000,000 Europeans are vociferously demanding immediate passage. Immigration officials, says the New York Tribune, state that out of ten of the immigrants now entering this country, seven are dependents—mostly women, children, and old men. Nine out of ten, according to Representative Albert Johnson, chairman of the House Committee on Immigration, settle in our already congested cities, making bad conditions worse. The National Industrial Council was recently informed by Commissioner Wallis of the existence of a far-reaching conspiracy, entered into by corrupt officials of European governments, the directorates of certain transatlantic steamship lines primarily interested in the transport of immigrants, and the police authorities of at least two European nations, to unload criminals and dangerous radicals in the port of New York. Many of these undesirables come in the guise of stowaways; others as ostensible members of the ship's crew, who desert as soon as they reach port. By these and similar devices, says Mr. Wallis, thousands of men who could not otherwise get past our immigration authorities are smuggled into the country. Moreover, says the Commissioner, he is informed that eight million emigrants are ready to come from Germany as soon as peace is declared: and he adds: "What will happen when the bars of Russia are let down can only be guessed." Discussing in the Washington Star this rising flood of immigration, which he considers "the most pressing, the most important, and the most vital question before the country to-day," Commissioner Wallis writes:

"We undoubtedly need a great many of these people; but

where? Our farms, for instance, can take care of great numbers for the farmers are crying for help all the time. Our coal mines need men; so do our cotton fields and a great many other places where solid, sober and substantial people of good intent will be welcome. But, then, our whole country is in the process of readjustment—thousands of people getting out of the war-emergency work and going into other channels. It undoubtedly would be a good thing if we could establish some sort of preferential selective scheme for the admission of these immigrants—for instance the admission of thousands who would go to the farms—and exclude the barterers and the lazy, for these are the classes that mostly make for radicalism. We need the man of good intentions but we can not establish any sort of preferential admission without first amending the Constitution of the United States.

“Numerous suggestions have been made for the handling of the coming millions and there are many bills before Congress on the subject. But it is a tremendous question. Some very sane and sober persons are in favor of shutting down entirely on immigration for a stated period—until the country can readjust itself to the new conditions which have followed in the wake of the war. But it is a very debatable question whether this is desirable.

“Others would limit it to immediate blood relationship; others put it on a percentage basis. In my opinion we are undoubtedly receiving today many of the very best type of immigrants that ever have come to this country. They are of all the nations on the face of the earth. The greater part of them say they are coming to get away from the conditions of unrest and dissension in their native lands. This very fact should be sufficient guaranty that these people are mostly desirable. There are Romanians, Greeks, Italians, Jews, French, British, Persians, Indians, Czecho-Slovaks, Poles, Arabians, Turks, Serbians, Norwegians, Finns, Danes, and West Indians.

“Look into the faces of the great majority of these people and you can plainly see that they are arriving at one of the happiest moments of their lives—their entrance into the United States. Question any one of them and they will all say they are coming here to get away from their own countries because of the disturbances, because they can not find work, and can not support their families. All of them evince a willingness and happiness to go to work at the tasks for which they are set down on the ships’ manifests—as mechanics, farmers, tailors, miners, potters, shoemakers, laborers, lumberjacks, bricklayers, and so on to the end of the list.

"But will they do so? That is the pivotal question and the one on which the whole treatment and solution of the menace depend."

Several editors, noting that the price of steerage tickets to America is now as high as the prewar price of a first class ticket, suggest that it must be only the well-to-do among Europe's peasantry and lower middle class who can meet this expense. And in the Grand Rapids News we read:

"Observers tell us the new immigrants are far better drest than they were in 1914, and Ellis Island officials declare they are bringing in much better household goods.

"Of the incoming people the Jews bring the most money, an average of \$300 each. The Dutch and Flemish come next with an average of \$237; then the Swiss, mostly German speaking, with \$235, then the English with \$214, the Polish with \$190, and the Scotch, Irish, Scandinavians, French, and Finnish, with an average of \$119. The north Italians bring in \$95 apiece, the south Italians \$62, the Portuguese \$41, while the Mexicans cross the border with only an average of \$29 in their purses.

"It costs the immigrants much more to cross the ocean than it did in prewar days. Steerage fares from European ports, which used to average \$25 to \$27, are now up to about \$110. When the immigrant changes his money into United States dollars it costs him \$100 to come from Copenhagen, \$88 from Genoa, \$125 from Hamburg, \$100 from Helsingfors, \$124 from Patras, and \$130 from Trieste, but this includes consular fees of \$10 and head tax of \$8. An alien must be fairly well to do to be able to afford the cost of emigrating to this country."

Europe is losing by immigration as many people in a year as she lost on the battlefield in a year of war, notes James Morgan in the Boston Globe. "First America drained away the gold of Europe and now we are draining her blood," remarks Mr. Morgan; and he continues:

"The whole meaning of our swollen immigration at present, exprest in simple terms, is that Europe finds herself unable to buy enough raw materials and food from us and that her people in great numbers are coming here to get those first essentials of existence. Mohammed is emigrating to the mountain since he cannot import it.

"Nor or we getting the hungriest and idlest of Europe. Our immigration is coming from the countries that were victorious in the war or from the neutral lands that were made comparatively prosperous by the war. . . .

"Instead of trying to stop their people from leaving, the European governments are frankly recognizing the necessity of losing them. Emigration is a safety valve for the stupid politicians who are in control. Without it Europe would blow up. . . .

"Instead of our receiving Europe's products in payment of what she owes us, she is sending us her producers and is defaulting on the interest."

While American labor, thru the American Federation, asks for the suspension of immigration; American business, apparently desires only its regulation. "As between the labor and business groups, the one in favor of exclusion and the other opposed to it, Republican leaders are far more likely to listen to the advice of business interests in considering a new immigration policy," thinks the New York Globe, which goes on to say:

"There is a feeling that the immigration problem will largely adjust itself in the next six months, on the theory that the flow of immigrants to this country will materially lessen when arrivals find idleness their lot instead of the prosperity they expected. The tide of immigration usually is responsive to business conditions, and a diminution is expected during the winter months when word gets abroad there is no work for newcomers in the United States."

Scares over immigration have been periodical with Congress for more than twenty years, and they have almost invariably resulted in restrictive legislation which would not be enforced or in restrictive legislation which could be and has not been enforced," remarkt the New York World, which suggests that "it might be well, perhaps, before proceeding to greater extremes in the matter, either to enforce the immigration laws we already have or to revise them so that they can be enforced." This point is emphasized also by the New York Herald, which says:

"Under our present laws, criminals, paupers, the mentally deficient, anarchists, persons suffering from contagious diseases, individuals liable to become public charges, and illiterates are excluded from admission. Alien stowaways are also ineligible for admission.

"If any persons falling within the prescribed classes are getting ashore here they are doing it in violation of our laws, and the enforcement of the existing statutes would protect us from them. If the laws are not being enforced the fault is with the immigration service."

The Boston News Bureau, contemplating the efforts of Congress to turn back the alien tide, is reminded of the experience of King Canute. "America, with its exhaustless resources waiting

for development, has more to fear from a deficit than from an excess of industrious immigrants," declares the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot; and the Rochester Times-Union reminds us that—

"Native-born Americans are not especially anxious to undertake the rough, unskild work which falls to the lot of the newcomers. Yet this work has to be done. Both figuratively and literally it lays the foundation and digs the subcellar of the industrial structure. Widen the base and there will be more space and jobs higher up."

"There is no 'cause for alarm' in the immigration situation, declares the Pittsburgh Chronicle-Telegraph. And the Baltimore Sun affirms that "there is now a shortage of about 4,000,000 workers in the so-called 'cheap labor market,' due to the fact that from 1914 to the current year the normal flow of European immigration to the United States was practically non-existent." The price of no immigration would be famine foodprices, predicts the New York Herald, in which we read:

"Congress can not suspend immigration either thru a temporary or a permanent exclusion measure without cutting the ground from under American agriculture. Congress can not embarrass, hinder, and cripple the American farmer without delivering a body blow against the American public.

"The American farmer can not produce profitable crops to sell at a reasonable price unless he can get labor that will work hard at reasonable wages. He will not try. American labor will not work on the farm at any price. Even alien labor which has been long enough in this country to be lured away from the farm and day labor to industrial jobs at short hours and easy money will not work on the farm at anything but top wages.

"The American farmer's only chance to get the labor which is an imperative requirement of abundant crops at a reasonable cost is thru the nation's immigration gateways."

To bar immigration would mean the continuation of high prices generally, argues the New York News Record. And in St. Louis Globe Democrat we read:

"Two arguments for unlimited immigration have always prevailed. One is that this country should maintain an open door to the oppressed of all nations, a refuge for seekers after liberty. But the days of autocracy and political oppression have passed in Europe, except in Russia, where the liberty-seekers are now the oppressors. The other is the economic industrial value of every able-bodied man who adds his production to the nation's wealth. Especially the cheaper forms of immigrant labor have at times been

great industrial value, and would now be of more value and less menace if we had viewed their coming with as much spiritual discernment as we did economic."

The heart of the problem, says the New York Globe, "is really not whether this country is threatened by a monstrous flood of immigration, but whether we are prepared to receive an immigration which, in prewar times, we would have regarded as normal." And this paper goes on to say:

"Behind the demand for restriction is not the desire to keep out 25,000,000 aliens, nor even 15,000,000 aliens, but the desire to keep out any considerable immigration whatever. The abnormal situation is not so much on the other side of the Atlantic as in this country. We are in a period of economic depression, of growing unemployment, and possibly headed for worse times. Under the circumstances, the desire to relieve additional pressure on our overcrowded labor market and our overcrowded cities is an honestly debatable one, but it should be discussed on its merits and not in a state of panic induced by the visions of alien deluges."

"The manner in which the immigration problem is handled for the next few years is bound to have a large effect on the future complexion of American life and thought," says the Detroit Free Press; and the Peoria Transcript reminds us that already "Chicago is 67 per cent foreign and New York is a miniature of Europe." "All the tax-dodgers of Europe are headed for the United States," declares the Peoria paper, which goes on to say:

"The present alien influx is not desirable. It is not self-supporting; it is coming for the specific purpose of undercutting American wages, and its presence will mean the lowering of American standards of living. At the present time we are not politically, economically, or industrially prepared for assimilation. Our schools are crowded, our housing is cramped, and our great cities, to which the foreigner naturally drifts, are overrun with criminals."

American workingmen and workingwomen must be protected from "an invasion that would be worse than a plague, avers the Providence News, which adds:

"Every man who owns a bit of property or has a going business is vitally interested in seeing that this enormous invasion shall be controlled. Once destroy the earning power and the efficiency of our industrial system here and we shall find the bread lines only an incident. Business will wither. Values will be wiped out overnight in the resulting depression that will come. Every line of business will suffer, from the railroads to the smallest dry goods store.

"Before the war immigration was becoming too much for us and Congress was hard at some solution of the problem. It was a grave question question then. It is a thousand times more so now and hits at the very vitals of our national progress."

"Until the foreign blood we have is absorbed so that it is made American, a further transfusion is anything but desirable," insists the Washington Herald, which emphasizes the necessity of "preserving the American type." And in the Chicago Tribune we read:

"The powerful influences which make it possible for the United States to take in many, if not all, races and nationalities and still keep it from becoming a polyglot nation, can be over taxt.

"We believe the United States is nearing its point of saturation. We believe this country can take care of a trickle of immigration, but not a flood.

"America must protect its strain, its blood, its breeding, and its political culture. It must breed true. The base was laid centuries ago by English, Scotch, Irish, Swedish, French, and Dutch pioneers. Upon that base the American nation has built its structure, which is not to be changed by new inhabitants, but which is to change them to inhabit it."

THROWING AWAY OUR BIRTHRIGHT

North American Review, February, 1922

By William Roscoe Thayer

Fifteen or twenty years ago, Mr. Joseph Lee, of Boston, wrote in a Boston newspaper a brief fable which he called Immigrants and Sparrows. It began as follows: "The English sparrow seems to me typical of the sort of immigrant that gives rise to an immigration problem. Like the great mass of undesirable accessions to our population, from the first importation of slaves to the latest pipe-line immigration fostered by the foreign steamship companies and other financial interests, he was brought over here on the theory of the need of immigration labor. It was thought that the native birds were incapable of dealing with the worms that were eating the elm trees, and the English sparrow was sent for because he represented the cheapest labor in sight applicable to that particular job. His coming very soon gave rise to the question whether the sparrows were not worse than the worms, to which William Travers made his famous reply; 'I d-dunno. N-n-never had the sparrows.' Certainly he has had the effect of driving out our native birds, at least from the Eastern cities in which, like similar importations, he has largely congregated. The individual sparrow who is brought over here may be happy, but it does not follow that the world's

happiness is increast by his importation. His coming does not lessen congestion on the other side; there are as many sparrows in England now as there were when the immigration began, or as there would have been if it had never taken place. Misery in Europe is not lessend by importing it to this country. It is merely presented with another continent to spread over. The net result of immigration of such a class is the substitution of a lower stratum of being for a higher one and the intrusting of the fortunes of our republic increasingly, to the stratum thus substituted."

In the years which have intervned between the publication of Mr. Lee's parable and the present, I have seen no more pertinent illustration of the manner in which our American immigration system works. The record of the potato bug or Colorado beetle might also be cited, and the actual losses to crops which it has occasiond are too well known to require a detaild statement. But the examples of the harm done by the unwise introduction of both the English sparrow and of the potato bug have been multiplied a thousand fold by our reckless treatment of the immigration problem.

A momentary pause has come as a result of the Great War, and of the enactment of the temporary three per cent restrictive law, which expires, by limitation, on June 30, 1922; but in the course of a few months the question will press upon us with renewed insistence, and upon our decision of it the welfare of the country may depend for many years; and not merely the welfare, but the very preservation, of the United States as the nation which the founders pland and every patriotic and intelligent citizen since then has wisht it to be. Even during this pause immigrants are entering this country at the rate of several hundreds a day. The number has varied; at the maximum flow it averaged 1,000 immigrants a day. (Now more than 2,000.) Does anyone know of any counteracting agencies here which can convert the most promising new aliens into Americans at that rate? This ratio would not affect the millions already here and not yet Americanized. Numbers do not make a nation strong. Only the character of its people can make it strong. Is it not time that we should abandon the delusion, which rejoiced but misled our fathers, that our principles were so beautiful and sound and just that even the untutord savage would adopt and practise them merely on knowing them? Principles cannot be improvised; they cannot be cramd as a boy is for his examination; they are the slow and steady fruit of trees that have had a long growth.

When the United States Government was formd under Wash-

ington, in 1789, its thirteen original states, altho sprung from various strains of mostly Anglo-Saxon stock, and altho jealously tenacious of their local rights and traditions, were nevertheless strongly united by the bonds of a common language and common ideals. And as the young nation grew, these things which they had in common strengthend their unity. The native Americans of that first generation realized that a continent of unlimited resources stretcht to the west of them, but they needed, to develop their Eldorado, more man-power. Washington himself did not believe in throwing open the gates to everybody, but in selecting so as to secure only the best. As our possibilities became understood in Europe, the stream of immigration began to pour across the Atlantic. Vigorous men, alert men, adventurous even, sold their possessions in the old country and faced fortune in the new. Then the marvelous development of inventions redoubld the work of those already here and causd the need for more. Before the year 1850 the United States as far west as the Mississippi was staked out, if not actually settld, and the rapid extension of railways filld in the bare regions and joind the chief cities.

The need of soldiers in the Civil War slightly stimulated immigration in some sections, while in others it fell off. The pay the newcomers received was small, but large enough to allure men who could earn only the lowest wages in Western Europe. We must remember that roughly from this time on—taking the year 1870 as the point of departure—the immigrant came from a less desirable class. In the earlier years, the fact that a man was an immigrant presupposed that he had initiative, resolution, and other virtues which made him a desirable accession to a new country. But later the immigrants came less from Western Europe, and more from Southwestern Europe and Asia and were drawn from the least desirable strata of population. They had not succeeded at home, but they hoped that by some stroke of fortune they might succeed in the United States.

And now there enterd another factor which tended to increase enormously the volume of immigration and to debase its quality. This factor was the steamship companies, which had no interest in the kind of immigrants they brought over, but only in their number. In the course of a generation these companies transported cargoes of immigrants who numberd millions in the aggregate, and who could not be blamed if they were utterly ignorant of American ideals. Steamship companies combd Italy and Southwestern Europe for passengers. Stories of the sudden and wonderful enriching of the immigrants after a few months in America, were

circulated with great effect. Posters were exhibited in remote Sicilian or Calabrian villages in which a ragged peasant might be seen embarking on the steamer at Naples, and, next year, driving down Fifth Avenue, New York, in his own limousine with a huge solitaire stud blazing on his shirt front.. Now undoubtedly many of the immigrants bettered themselves and the children and the grandchildren of some of them are financially on a higher level than their relatives who did not come over. But what of America?

The prosperity of America is, and should be, the first consideration, but only recently have Congress and other official bodies which ought to guard the public health—and I mean not only the physical health, but moral, intellectual and spiritual—paid attention to this work. "Big Business" contracted for them wherever they could be found and without inquiring into their fitness in any capacity except that of "hands." But we found that even "hands" can exercise an unexpected influence on the communities where they are thrown. They were Socialists among them, and Anarchists, and all sorts of cranks. More ominous was the fact that many of them, coming from countries in which ideals very different from ours flourished, wished to spread and perpetuate those ideals. They naturally thought that our ways and principles and aims were wrong and bad. It was much easier to smash ours and to go on with theirs. This need not surprise us. In Russia, where Bolshevik and Soviet doctrines have run riot for three years, thirty million Russians have died, mostly of starvation. Here is a strange contradiction! A system by which, the Bolsheviks preach wealth can be acquired, is precisely the system which destroys not only wealth, but the inhabitants also. And so would it be, if any of these mad doctrines were able to get the upper hand in the United States.

Our immigration laws attempt to prevent the coming to our shores of all avowed Anarchists, criminals and other subversive elements. But with the best will in the world, and after taking what seemed to be extreme precautions, they have not succeeded in excluding these undesirables, nor will they ever do so until psychologists discover some means of finding out what a man is thinking and planning, while he refuses to speak or write his intentions. One must see how inadequate any hurried inspection, the best which can be afforded under present conditions by the Immigrant Bureau, must be for protecting the people of America from the swarms that pour in to mingle with it. What alienist would pretend in private practice that he could diagnose the insanity of a patient in a minute's inspection? Many forms of mental disease are very elusive or slow in manifesting themselves. And yet, if the inspector

fails to discover the germs or the disease in some immigrant who hurries by, becomes a resident, marries and has a family, the immigrant may propagate insanity which would run thru generations. This is no imaginary evil. The record of the Jukes family is too hideously plain. The tribe of Jukes continued for generations.

Doubtless more care is taken now than used to be taken to shut out immigrants whom insanity or loathsome contagious diseases would render a danger to our population. But any inspection which is limited to a minute or less for each case cannot be thoro. Indeed, it must seem a mockery to everyone who realizes how much is at stake. To make our inspection worthy of this great country and adequate to the need of safeguarding the health of the 110,000,000 persons here, is something that should be insisted upon. One obvious means of securing proper examination would be to have the prospective emigrants examined by an American official at the American Consulate abroad from which the emigrant expects to sail. Then, if for any reason he is found unfit and denied a passport, he cannot make the voyage over here and either be turned back or succeed in sneaking his way past our immigration authorities. I remember sailing a dozen years ago from a southern Mediterranean port. In the stateroom next to that occupied by my wife was placed an emigrant said to be sick, but after a few hours on the water he came to, and proved to be a homicidal maniac who tried to break out of his cabin and kept up shrieks and violence. When we neared Gibraltar, the poor maniac was drugged and was let over the side of the ship, half-naked as he had torn off most of his clothes, and was taken ashore. Had he been examined by an American official doctor at the Consulate he would have been permitted to sail. It was notorious a few years ago that a certain European Government made a business of shipping its imbeciles and incompetents to the United States, choosing points of entrance where it found access easy. Assuming that now the personnel of the Immigration Bureau is perfect, and that there are no dishonest officials who connive at smuggling in improper aliens, I repeat that with the small force employed it is impossible to consider our inspection of immigrants as adequate.

We must not forget that our inspectors are obliged constantly to circumvent the attempts of friends of immigrants, who, for whatever reason, work for their admittance. Immigrants, who have come over here and taken root, naturally send for their families and friends to join them, and every deceit is practised, if they have defects which would disqualify them, to run them past the inspectors' scrutiny. A striking example of this occurred six or eight years

ago when a man, who had succeeded in getting by the inspectors, sent for his family. When they arrived at the American port, the inspector discovered that they all had a loathsome disease. One of the boys was already blind and could not walk down the gang-plank to the wharf without falling down.. They were all obviously disqualified from entering the country, and were condemned to deportation. But someone who belonged to their race created a great stir and the newspapers abetted him and tried to rouse the American people against the terrible cruelty of separating a husband from his wife, and a father from his children.

In dealing with immigrants, we must never forget that blood with them is thicker than water, and often determines their actions without respect to justice, or law, or even common sense. A few months ago a Sinn Fein emissary came over as a stowaway, and the Sinn Feiners hailed the fact as an act of heroism and as a proof of great adroitness. For some reason which was not explained, he was not deported at once, he remained here unmolested as long as he chose, and for all I know may be lingering here still. Examples of this kind simply prove that many naturalized Americans care more for some other country than for the United States. This fact explains, but can never excuse, many of the evils that have sprung from dishonest immigration.

I have mentioned some of these considerations because they belong in any discussion of immigration. At the present moment, when the influx of foreigners is temporarily checked, it behooves us to weigh the entire problem most seriously, so that we may be able to discover and formulate an immigration law which shall be informed by experience and adapted so far as we can foresee to the needs of the future.

Take first what is commonly called the "practical side." Do we need more immigrants? Today there are said to be nearly 3,000,000 persons out of work in the United States. Does any one pretend that we can go on being regarded as a sane people, if we add by immigration a million a year to the number of unemployed? The fact that we do not need new contingents of workingmen at present ought to make it much easier to establish a rational immigration system. What we need is that the laborers already here should labor and give an honest day's work for an honest day's pay.

As we are not seeking employes, we can fix the terms on which immigrants will be admitted to the country. Foremost among these terms is the consideration of health. We must agree to no provision so elastic that immigrants who may be a source of disease or a charge on the public may worm their way in. Danger from this quarter was never greater.

A few months ago, the former Commissioner, Mr. Wallis, stated before the Senate Immigration Committee, that "Eastern Europe is in the grip of four epidemics—typhus, typhoid, dysentery and tuberculosis." It is from these countries that great caravans of miserable human beings are winding their slow march westward in the hope of reaching ports from which they can be taken to the United States. In Russia, since the Bolshevik regime came into power four years ago, perhaps thirty million persons have died of starvation, massacre and hardships. The bodies of many of the victims of these horrors often lay for a long time unburied, thus increasing the source of pestilence. Even in other parts of Europe which escaped the worst sufferings, the health of many of the survivors has been undermined. From two million to ten million Germans are said to be waiting to emigrate to the United States as soon as they can find passage. Numerically, no single invasion of the ancient Barbarians into the Roman world could compare with this. Why should the United States accept the handicap of inferior candidates of whatever race for American citizenship? Why should it willingly assume the post of lazaret of the world? In ordinary life, if a child has scarlet fever, or diphtheria, or smallpox, it is carefully isolated for its own good, and for the good of any who might run the risk of infection by it. By what argument, either moral or medical, therefore, should the United States assume the responsibility of caring for the suffering, and curing, if it can, the derelicts and diseased of Europe and of Asia?

American sentimentalists, who have been from the start very serious obstacles to any rational solution of the immigration problem, will assuredly cry out: "If the peoples of devastated Europe need a refuge, we must take them in, no matter whether they have typhus or any other disease, however repellant, and however destructive of the community. Our duty is to succor today those who are in distress, no matter what the future may require."

To the appeals of sentimentalism such as this I have seen no answer more rational and cogent than that of Professor Robert DeC. Ward, one of the most far-sighted experts on immigration whom I know of. He says:

"The indiscriminate kindness which we may seem to be able to show to the coming millions of European or Asiatic immigrants can in no conceivable way counterbalance the harm that these people may do to our race, especially if large numbers of them are mentally and physically unfit. Indiscriminate hospitality to immigrants is a supremely short-sighted selfish, ungenerous, un-American policy. It may give some of us, for the moment, a

comfortable feeling that we are providing a 'refuge for the oppressed.' But that is as narrow a state of mind as that which indiscriminately gives alms to any person on the street who asks for money. Such 'charity' may, truly, produce a warm feeling of generosity in the giver himself. But almsgiving of this sort does more harm than good. It is likely to pauperize him who receives, and it inevitably increases the burden of pauperism which future generations will have to bear. . . . Our policy of admitting freely practically all who have wisht to come, and of encouraging them in every possible way to come, has not only tremendously complicated all our own national problems, but has not helpt the introduction of political, social, economic and educational reforms abroad. Indeed, it has rather delayd the progress of these very movements in which we, as Americans, are so vitally interested. Had the millions of immigrants who have come to us within the last quarter-century remaind at home, they would have insisted on the introduction of reforms in their own countries which have been delayd, decade after decade, because the discontent of Europe found a safety-valve by flying to America. . . . Our duty as Americans, interested in the world-wide progress of education, of religious liberty, of democratic institutions, is to do everything in our power to preserve our own institutions intact, and at the same time to help the discontented millions of Europe and Asia to stay in their own countries; to shoulder their own responsibilities; to work out there, for themselves, what our own forefathers workt out here, for us and for our children."

It is evident that in order to meet our national needs Congress must prepare an immigration law providing greater restriction and a more rational plan. The present law, for instance, bases the admission of immigrants upon percentages, each race or nationality being entitled to a certain proportion of the total number of person belonging to that nationality already in the United States. One obvious defect in this rule is that it does not cover the total number of naturalized members of the given nationality.

All attempts to distribute immigrants according to certain localities have thus far faild. It was supposed, for instance, that peasants from agricultural districts would prefer to settle in agricultural districts here, but they did not. Nearly twenty years ago Baron Mayor des Planches, the open-minded Italian Ambassador to this country, hoped that by planting colonies of Italians in some of our Southern States, he might find conditions which would be favorable to the colonists, who might even, in some districts, replace the negroes; but the facts contradicted his benevolent dream.

One further element of the problem should never be lost sight of; that is, the assimilability of the races from which immigrants spring. This can never be determined by theory. We thought for a long time that one class of our immigrants were most desirable, because they seemed most easy of assimilation. The recent war undeceived us. It showed us that we had millions in the United States who had never been affected or modified by what we regard as essential Anglo-Saxon ideals of Liberty and Democracy.

The immigration problem can never be settled wisely and justly unless it be settled by those who have a vision of what the United States stands for. The United States will cease to be the land of opportunity unless we preserve unsullied and undiminished the ideals by which, and in which, this Republic was created. The forener who hopes by plotting to win advantage for his creed over here, tho he were twenty times naturalized, would remain a forener. He who seeks to involve the American states in the political or religious quarrels of the country from which he came is no American; he is a traitor of the baser sort. That citizen who would use his country for his private gain deserves to be uncitizenized. No true American will consent to the admission to our country of foreners who will lower its standard in health, in morals, in intelligence, or in patriotism. Until we realize that we have inherited a sacred trust and that we must preserve it sacredly, we too are but imperfect Americans.

A CONSTRUCTIVE IMMIGRATION POLICY

BY WILLIAM H. BARR,

President of the Inter-racial Council

Current History—Jan. 21, 1921.

We have been favored of late with many startling interviews and speeches about the so-called alien hordes that are overrunning America and the fifteen to twenty-five million more immigrants who "want to come." The voices of dispassionate thinkers on this subject, so vital to the nation's welfare, have been drowned by sensation mongers until public sentiment seemed ripe to allow the making of drastic laws—laws absolutely without precedent in this nation's history and in violation of all its traditions—that would cut off immigration, to set over against them the cold facts of the case.

The latest figures on immigration published by the United States Government are from the beginning of the fiscal year, July to November, 1920, inclusive—a period of five months. During this time there were 472,859 immigrants admitted, while 181,-

505, persons left this country. The balance is, therefore, 291,354 for five months. This is a monthly average of 58,271 net immigration for the period covered. If this average should continue for the fiscal year 1921, the total net immigration for the year would be 699,252. This is less than the immigration for 1913 or for 1914.

As a matter of fact, the immigration during the period of the World War was so small, while the outgo of men of military age was so great, that it will take four or five years of maximum immigration to make up the loss. This was demonstrated in the 1920 census, the first census on record to show an increase as low as 14.9 per cent. The population of the United States is 105,683,108, according to the census of 1920, as compared with a total of 91,972,266 for 1910 and 75,994,575 for 1900. This is an increase since 1910 of 13,710,842, or only 14.9 per cent, as compared with an increase from 1900 to 1910 of 14,977,691, or 21 per cent.

It is thus apparent that it is not the number of actual arrivals but the prospect of future floods of immigration that causes all this alarm. It can be demonstrated, I think, that this is a false alarm.

Only 1,000,000 Yearly

Let us first consider what experts have to say on the subject of the fifteen to twenty-five million immigrants who want to come. In an interview in the New York Herald, P. A. S. Franklin, President of the International Mercantile Marine, declared that the number of would-be immigrants is only slightly larger than it was before the war, and that there are fewer ships to carry them. About a million a year is the maximum capacity of the Atlantic shipping, says this expert on shipping and at that rate it would take fifteen years to bring over the fifteen million refugees. In that time conditions in Europe would be so settled that the desire to escape from post-war conditions would no longer be a factor.

Mr. Franklin contended that the immigration alarmists fail to compute the number who go back, which changes the whole status of the so-called "alien invasion." His figures for the calendar year 1920—including Canadian estimates for the sake of comparison—are as follows:

United States Ports				
	First	Second	Third	Total
	Class	Class	Class	
Westbound -----	68,637	131,636	484,124	684,397
Eastbound -----	63,725	92,625	302,433	458,783
Grand Total -----				1,143,180

Canadian Ports

	First Class	Second Class	Third Class	Total
Westbound -----	6,344	54,032	111,241	171,617
Eastbound -----	4,975	34,713	57,484	97,172
Grand Total -----				268,789

Of the total number of passengers both ways between the United States and Europe, or 1,143,180, only 484,124 are steerage passengers to America, against 302,433 of the same class going back. The net immigration of steerage passengers, therefore, is only 181,691 for 1920.

Another steamship man who testified before the Senate Committee on Immigration is Lawson Sanford, representing Phelps Brothers & Co. His net immigration total for steerage passengers—197,000—corresponded closely with Mr. Franklin's estimate.

Mr. Sanford had a good deal to say about the present lack of transportation facilities. He declared that shipping was about the same as in 1907, less the German ships, which amounted to 20 per cent. About 90 per cent of the German liners are out of service. As in 1907 the admissions were 1,221,658, Mr. Sanford's estimate would virtually agree with the others that a million a year is the most we can expect at present. But these figures do not seem as startling as the fifteen or twenty-five million refugees who "want to come." Therefore, they are not so prominently played up.

Appearances Deceptive

Before the Senate committee, Frederick A. Wallis, Commissioner of Immigration for the Port of New York, put the situation very clearly when he said that there was a vast difference between "wanting to come" and being able to come." About a million a year is the maximum which he estimated as being able to make the difficult and expensive trip to America. With a million a year as the highest estimate of these authorities we must always remember that there are large numbers going back, so that the net immigration will be far below that figure.

Another witness before the Senate committee threw a new light on the picture of swarms of refugees waiting for passports. Like the stage army that marches round and round back of the scenes, the appearance of great numbers is given by a comparatively small number of people. Thus the 2,500 persons standing line every day before the American passports office in Warsaw did not mean 2,500 different applicants a day, but practically the same 2,500 coming back day after day. Such was the testimony of John

L. Bernstein of the Hebrew Sheltering Aid Society of New York, who said that at the time he witness this sight only 40 to 70 passports a day were being issued. It is true he declared, that 250,000 Jewish women and children wish to come to America to be united with the heads of their families now here, but there are no funds to bring anything like that number. Regarding the statement that 58,000 Jews came to the United States in October, he declared that only 12,217 came in that month, or less than one-fourth the number claimed by immigration opponents. Mr. Bernstein also testified that, while the desire to emigrate was strong, the desire to remain in Poland was stronger, provided conditions became settled there.

Some Deterrent Forces

A point overlooked by immigration alarmists is that most people hesitate to undertake the great adventure of seeking their fortune across the seas. This applies not only to Poland, but to every nation that sends us immigrants. It should be borne in mind that religious and political freedom is guaranteed in most countries of Europe at present. America is no longer the only refuge from oppression, and, therefore, those who come here will do so mainly for economic reasons.

The railroad and steamship fares, the fees for passports and visas and the incidental expenses amount to a small fortune when computed in the money of the countries of Europe. It is estimated that the passage costs the price of a little farm over there, and we may be sure that as soon as the readjustment in Europe is well under way the number of people who "want to come" will be far below the estimated fifteen or twenty-five million.

It must be remembered that, in addition to the prevailing destitution in Europe, there was the lure of exceedingly high wages in America during 1918, 1919 and 1920, and that there were more jobs than men to fill them. The conditions of unemployment that make the immigrant unwelcome at present, according to the exclusionists, will also make the alien reluctant to come.

Immigration obeys to a great extent the law of supply and demand. When wages were at their top notch here the word went out to Europe, and increased immigration resulted. When news of the closing of our mills and shops penetrates the mind of Europe there will be a decline in immigration, law or no law. But to set an arbitrary period for the suspension of immigration is to interfere with a process as natural as the law of gravitation. It is proposed to exclude immigration for a year, yet before the end of the twelve months we may be clamoring for more help to man our industries and till our fields.

Need of Farm Labor

Already there are indications of the same sort of farm labor shortage in 1921 that caused such great losses last year. According to the best authorities—the employing agriculturists of the west and south—we shall have to face the same labor shortage this year. A resolution passed in December by the Southern Alluvial Land Association protested strongly against the exclusion of farm laborers. According to Secretary F. D. Beneke of that organization, not more than one-third of the 25,000 acres of rich bottom lands in the immediate lower Mississippi Valley is being utilized, altho virtually all of it can be brought under the plow and made highly profitable because of excellent natural advantages. There are many farmers of foreign birth in the region and they have contributed materially in bringing it from idleness to productivity. Most of them have proved to be excellent citizens in every respect. The text of the resolution is as follows:

WHEREAS there is a bill before Congress proposing the restriction of immigration into the United States of America for a period of two years; and

WHEREAS during the years 1917, 1918, 1919 and 1920 the farmers of the United States experienced great difficulties in making their crops on account of an acute shortage of farm labor; and

WHEREAS there are hundreds of abandoned farms in all parts of the United States as a result of a farm-labor shortage; and

WHEREAS there are many fertile farming sections of the United States in an undeveloped state, awaiting the coming of the farmer, including the rich alluvial region of the lower Mississippi Valley; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the Southern Alluvial Land Association, this 11th day of December, 1920, That we strongly protest against the exclusion of European farmers and farm labor from the United States, and that we petition Congress to admit such European immigrants as will hasten the development of America's agricultural resources.

From the Northwestern agricultural sections comes the same cry of "Help Wanted." Testifying before the Senate committee, Walter W. Liggett, Deputy Labor Commissioner of North Dakota, stated that there were about 20,000,000 acres of land in his state that would not be tilled next year, tho this vast area would be available to raise food products if men could be found to cultivate it.

Employers of labor in various industries appeared before the Senate committee to ask for exemptions in their own particular line. Cigar men from Tampa wanted Cuban cigarmakers admitted. The Florida growers who produce the early vegetables that surprise us so pleasantly in the midwinter menus asked that labor from the

Bahamas be exempt. The beet growers, wool and cattle men of the Southwest wanted Mexicans to be permitted to come in, and so on. Every employer spoke for his own labor supply, but in summing up the testimony it appeared that the need for unskilled immigrant labor was general.

Unemployment exists in certain lines, that is true; but to shut out our supply of farmers, coal miners, or iron workers for a year because the textile and automobile men are temporarily idle is not logical.

The weight of the testimony was to the effect that strict enforcement of the existing laws would shut out the diseased, the mentally, morally or physically unfit, and also those whose anarchistic activities would threaten American institutions. Such laws as exist must be adequately enforced and provision should be made for their enforcement. This would quiet the alarm of those ill-informed persons who see in every alien a dangerous "red" or a public charge.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

BY JAMES J. DAVIS,

United States Secretary of Labor

The Outlook, June 7, 1922

If I had the time, I should like nothing better than to study the histories of the nations and the races of the earth away back as far as our records of early civilization go. I should like still better to go beyond these records and help in the great research work that is still being done in an effort to bring to light the stories of primeval life and struggle for existence among the tribes of this old world of ours long before the oldest of the nations now existing boasted of a semblance of civilization. But I have been deprived of the opportunity of delving far even into the labyrinths of comparatively modern history.

Strange to say, I was prevented from learning a great deal of history as a boy because of the very fact that makes that subject so interesting for me—I was an immigrant boy. The struggle for a livelihood in a new country was so full of what I call experience, that at an early age I was working as a puddler in a steel mill, contributing a small share toward keeping our family happy and contented.

I have no idea when it was that man first migrated from "the cradle of humanity." It is enough to say that men first felt the pinch for room and began to go out to seek new fortunes, bigger herds, and larger and greener pastures. They found wild beasts and barriers of mountains and of water and of forests. The

more daring and courageous ventured far and found keen pleasure in the adventures of wild lands. Feats of strength and endurance were the pride of the leaders of their bands. And so it came about that the strong explored into far countries, set up their own kingdoms, and prospered, while the weaker of mind and body, the lazy and dependent, stayed behind, only moving when conditions in their old localities—crowding, scourges of disease and filth, or of exploitation of more ambitious hostile foes—forced them on in the direction the more energetic of their races had gone before.

One after another great pioneering nations have risen and fallen. We are all familiar enough with ancient and modern history to have heard of periods of Roman, Danish, Norwegian, Spanish, British, and other international conquests. Long before Christopher Columbus discovered America the Norwegians had been here, and before them, according to Chinese history, Buddhist priests had visited the coast of California as early as the fifth century.

Early immigration to every new country consisted of the very bravest, staunchest, and most loyal subjects or citizens of their mother countries. It was necessarily so, because of the great hardships and dangers of travel. It took courage to sail the viking ships of the Norsemen on their journeys of thousands of miles, battling the tempestuous northern seas of cold and ice, and strength to pull the oars they used.

It took the same courage and strength in the days of the Pilgrim settlers who came to our shores, but of still more importance in building the foundation for our advanced civilization was the strength of character which prompted their coming. Peace-loving, fearless, and conscientious, as well as strong physical beings, ready to battle for what they believed was right, strong in Christian faith—these were the people who began the work of construction of the greatest nation of the world. A greater love for liberty and a greater respect for the rights of individuals, together with a determination and willingness to endure the hardships of pioneer life, drew to America the very best blood of every nation of Europe.

Conditions of emigration to America have changed. No longer is ocean travel beset with danger and hardships nor sacrifice of wealth. Steamship travel is luxurious; the steerage of a steam liner even forty years ago was superior to many, many homes of the poorer classes of Europe; and this travel when the new immigration started became cheap—at times passage from Hamburg to Chicago has been offered as low as \$10 a person, and at this price any one could afford to travel.

Every inducement for emigration was offered: A big and new country, money to be had for the asking! It required very little work to become wealthy, as these peasants counted wealth, in America. At least such were the stories circulated, and are even now being told in Europe.

Needless to say, the type of immigrants coming to America after the difficulties were removed and the thought of hardships eliminated changed, and they began to come in increasing numbers. To the European immigration was also added a large influx of Oriental life, until finally Congress found it necessary to place restriction upon immigration for the protection of American citizens.

First were hard Chinese laborers by prohibiting their immigration here for a period of ten years. Later Congress passed a permanent Oriental Exclusion Act, which prohibited immigration from certain prescribed areas of the earth's surface, and this Exclusion Law is in force today, its efficiency impaired somewhat by subterfuges resorted to for the purpose of violating the laws and the court decisions which have modified apparently the original intent of the law.

We excluded the Oriental because we believe that his lower standard of living, the low wages for which he was willing to work, would impair our own standards and the efficiency of our institutions. This was right but no less correct was the attitude of our Congress in advocating and adopting certain standards of health to be required of all our immigrants. Experience has taught us that if we let into our country men and women physically incapable of self-support they become public charges. Sooner or later they drain upon the National or community wealth—they take everything and give nothing, while those really responsible, those who received what benefits they have conferred, or who would have received the benefits had there been any, are relieved of responsibility and we pay the bill.

But it was not primarily the expense of keeping public charges we objected to. We feared a more serious menace—that from dangerous and loathsome contagious disease. Life in foreign lands among filth and dirt brought upon the countries of the Old World great plagues of typhus, cholera, leprosy, tuberculosis, and many other diseases.

The United States was a new and clean country, it was vast and there was room for expansion, but to permit every disease of Europe and Asia to come in meant ruin. No one doubts the wisdom of our policy of weeding out the sick, the maimed, the halt, the blind, the imbecile, the feeble-minded, and those convicted of crimes.

But even with the selective system of immigration, by which

process we weed out the defectives, there have come in many aliens undesirable for various reasons. Large numbers of nationals of certain countries have established themselves in communities, setting up their own standards and holding aloof from the institutions and facilities which work toward assimilation, preventing a thorough boiling of the melting-pot. *Especially during very recent years has there been a noticeable clotting in the boiling process, either we have put too much in the pot or we have not stirred fast enough; but, at any rate, we have got to take out the lumps or break them up and smooth out the mass.*

I attribute most of our difficulties to ignorance. We all know that the facilities for education in many of the countries of Europe are not what they might be. None of them equal the facilities offered in the United States to every person. In most states here it is compulsory that every child should be well grounded in fundamental subjects. I do not hesitate in saying that our high schools of today are equal, and perhaps superior, to many of the universities of only a few generations ago. There is a very large percentage of illiteracy in Europe, and of late years, and prior to the enactment of the Literacy Test Law, we drew heavily upon these illiterate classes. Lack of education breeds misunderstanding, and this misunderstanding is responsible for much of the strife, the civil war, and turmoil in social and industrial affairs all over the world.

As an illustration of how ignorance transplanted from Europe endangers our political and industrial life, I want to cite a case which was brought to my attention only recently. A Russian was about to be deported to his native land for the distribution of Anarchistic literature. He had a wife and several children, the children born in America. A delegation waited upon me and pleaded the hardship which this deportation would mean to the family. I immediately telegraphed to Washington for the records in the case. He spoke but a word or two of English, altho he had been in America for eleven years. He had been convicted of spreading Anarchistic doctrines. In fact, he was the head and feet of a subdivision of a big Red organization. He made the statement at the time of his arrest that Russia had the ideal Government, and that the Government of the United States ought to be overthrown and be made over just as the Russian had been. In other words he would have us go through all the strife and civil war that country has passed and is passing through! It would mean that our citizens would have no property rights and human life would be held at almost nothing. I said that it might be a hardship to this man's family, but not nearly so great a hardship as it would be for our country to allow him to carry on his Red activities

here. There was nothing to prevent his taking his family to Russia if he wisht, and if that country was so much better than ours, then he had the privilege of enjoying it. We as Americans want America to be governd as we want it. That is our privilege. If this man had only had the proper education, so that he could have understood a representative form of government, he might have been saved deportation, because undoubtedly he would have entered whole-heartedly into our scheme of things.

There are thousands of other aliens in the United States who are in just that same position. At present, there are over 13,000,000 foreign-born whites here. Approximately 1,750,000 of those over ten years of age are illiterate.

Our present naturalization laws, with the addition of a few amendments added from time to time for the purpose of clarifying their provisions, were adopted in 1906. Prior to that time our naturalization system amounted to very little less than an international scandal. Citizenship could be bought or sold. It became almost a commodity to be purchased in the open market. The present laws have changed this to a large extent, and now we have an orderly, altho I believe still inefficient, method of naturalizing foreners. Since the enactment of the 1906 law nearly 1,500,000 foren-born were naturalized. This represents the clothing with citizenship of something over 3,000,000. At present there are well over 6,000,000 more who are eligible for citizenship.

There is no doubt in my mind that we should provide more and better facilities for educating and Americanizing the immigrant. We have too many unnaturalized foreners here for their own and our good. We ought to teach them the meaning of citizenship and then give them a chance to qualify by properly educating them for the duties and privileges which that honor confers. There should be co-operation whereby one may know the needs of the other to the benefit of our foren-born brother and sister who have come here, we must assume, for the purpose of becoming one of us. If, on the other hand, it is the intention of these aliens to take from us only, to tear down our institutions, wreck our Government, and assume none of the duties imposed upon us as citizens, then we do not want them.

There is only one way in which we can get behind this movement in an efficient manner, and that is to know who is the alien, where he is, and what he needs; and there is only one way in which we can properly survey the work—that is, by requiring each and every alien to report, or to enrol, at a specified time at a designated place and give us the necessary information to enable us intelligently to determine just what solvents we should

place in our melting pots and just how much fire it will take to boil it.

I have advocated this enrolment for a long time. I do so with a full knowledge of all that confronts the immigrant, for I was one of them. Under all the tests which we might give looking toward a sifting out or a selection of immigrants, whether in the United States or in Europe, we would be sure to get Red leaders from Europe, while thousands of hard-working, good, honest immigrants, capable of becoming real assets, would be hard. Education for citizenship by enlarging the Bureau of Naturalization in the Department of Labor so as to make it a Bureau of Citizenship will do more for the protection of America and the aid of the alien or immigrant than any other one thing that I know of.

The fact that immigration has changed—that the men now coming to us are not as hardy and determined as before—does not mean that they cannot become desirable citizens. They merely need more opportunity, a more definite program for education and assistance in following it. The Bureau of Citizenship is the natural agency for the carrying out of such a program, for citizenship means more than the legal process of naturalization.

The first essential in educating for citizenship is the teaching of English. The alien cannot understand America until he understands her language. Neither can the American understand the alien, because he has no means of communicating with him. They live apart. Only by knowing English can the alien understand his job. He becomes more efficient by being able to understand the instructions and orders given to him. Accidents are fewer for the same reasons, so that this knowledge is a kind of insurance.

It also opens greater opportunities for industrial and commercial advancement, for only by knowing what is going on about him can one take advantage of the many opportunities presented to him. In all our large cities educational advantages are offered for the learning of new trades or improving the one which a worker has already selected for his life's work. The Y. M. C. A., Knights of Columbus, and other private organizations, and even the public schools, carry on this work so that the instruction may be obtained after the regular hours of labor and at such a small cost that practically every one can afford it. But unless the alien intelligently understands English, this opportunity for self-help is denied him.

The material benefit which comes from knowing English is not the only one secured. Many nationalities with different tongues make up the population of the United States. Under Old World conditions, there are national hatreds one for another, and these

are not left behind when the immigrant leaves home. How can a changed heart come unless they all speak a common language, the language of the country of whose citizenship they desire to become a part? All the old hatreds and misunderstandings, to my mind, were largely due to lack of a common means of communication. Unless this obstacle is removed there is bound to be friction here as well as there.

We do not need to worry so much about the children of the aliens, who by our laws are compelled to go to school and acquire an education. Our problem is largely with the adult alien. The child will eventually be absorbed, because we compel him to learn our language, our ideals, our institutions, and prepare him in that way for the duties of citizenship.

And this brings a new danger—the danger of estranging the child from the parent. Unfortunately, not all of the younger generation have that feeling for parents which should make them honor and respect their mothers and fathers, uncouth and ignorant, after they themselves have secured an American education with all the refinement which goes with it.

And the adult should feel the responsibility toward the child. His lack of an education makes it more difficult for the children to learn their lessons at school. It puts an added burden upon them in their play as well as their work. How often we hear the slurs of American children against their fellow-pupils and play-mates because of the ignorance of their parents. We ought to put them all in a class and give the parents a chance which they have never had to enjoy the privileges of an education. They came to this country in search of something better. The more we can give them, the more we will get in return. The English language is the basis for all of this.

As Secretary of Labor, I am called upon in many, many cases to try to effect settlements in industrial disputes. Last year there were more than 460 such cases brought to me, so that I have had a great opportunity to observe the causes of industrial warfare. One of the noticeable factors, I find, is the ignorance of the alien workmen in industry. There are more difficulties to adjust where they are employed, and in analyzing the situation I attribute most of them to lack of understanding, not only of our language and of the conditions of employment, but also of the institutions of our Government. You cannot blame these men for they never had the opportunity of learning the fundamentals of economic law. Many of them can neither read nor write, and under these conditions no other result can be expected.

Our great problem, then, is to educate the alien, and I believe

that in the majority of cases the alien is not only anxious to use facilities for education if they are given him, but is willing and able to pay for the privilege; and so I say, enrol every alien. Charge every wage-earner a small fee and provide the very best advantages of education for him. Then let our citizenship officers give each alien a card which he should present periodically for notations as to the progress made in his studies as well as his character and conduct in the community. At the time of the enrolment the officer will direct him to the proper school and see that he gets the proper training thru the educational authorities.

Under the immigration laws, the immigration authorities take into custody for deportation such aliens as become public charges within five years after their entry into this country. Many of the aliens are in hazardous employment. The wage-earner may become totally disabled, killed, or perhaps die of disease, leaving a family deportable under our laws. It strikes me that it would be far better if a part of the fund collected from the alien thru enrolment were to be used for the purpose of taking care of these dependents rather than deporting them to the countries from which they came. I would like to see this done, because I know how the father undoubtedly felt when he came here; that he came in order that his family might have the benefit of the opportunities here in our country not offered in his own. He came, not only for his personal enjoyment of our political life, but for the advantages which were held out for his family. Surely he would be glad of the opportunity to invest in that type of insurance which would provide facilities for taking care of his family should they be likely to become public charges. With this money we could, if necessary, pay for their keep or build large homes and schools to take care of these people. They would be under our direction and we would know that the potential citizenship there raised would be fully qualified for the privilege of citizenship which they seek.

Another very important feature of the enrolment of aliens is in the administration of the naturalization laws. Under the present law, when a declarant proves up on his petition, he must produce two witnesses who have known him for five years and can testify as to his character and fitness. That is a provision which is exceedingly difficult for many aliens to comply with. Often the alien's employment carries him from one jurisdiction to another, or perhaps the movings of those about him makes it impossible to secure a satisfactory witness for many, many years. When he can, in many cases it is at great expense. Under the enrolment plan, a certificate of enrolment with notation upon its face could be used

as a substitute for the two witnesses and would certainly facilitate final action on citizenship petitions.

When the petitioner receives his final certificate of citizenship, he will come into court and demonstrate his knowledge of the country and our Government. He will speak English, and understand those about him. The court session will be impressive and turned into what we term in fraternal societies a testimonial meeting, and each will give a testimony of what citizenship will mean to him, and what he will do to further the good of the cause. These meetings will be highly inspirational, and will do much to place citizenship upon a higher plane.

In the old days of the Roman civilization no greater honor could be conferred upon a man than to make him a citizen of Rome. Is our own country any less great than Rome or should it be any less an honor for a foren-born person to be granted the privilege of American citizenship than was the privilege of Roman citizenship centuries ago? Let every safeguard be put upon it.

I have heard some opposition to the enrolment features provided for in the Naturalization Law which is now pending in Congress. The radical papers and radical leaders oppose it. Other foren-language papers and foren leaders have heartily indorst the plan, which goes to show that this new method of Americanization and naturalization will do more for the country than merely confer citizenship upon foren-born people. The immigrant who comes here with a purpose of becoming one of us, abiding by our laws and contributing to our welfare as well as his own, will find the new law of vast benefit to him. The Red leader and the Anarchist will find in it only Government protective machinery to thwart his plan for alienizing America. Our whole purpose must be to Americanize the alien before the alien alienizes America.

OUR IMMIGRATION PROBLEM

BY ETTA V. LEIGHTON

Current History, April, 1922

It has been said that the only way to Americanize the forrener is to understand him. Of course, our main aim is that he shall understand us, and if that result can be better attained by our understanding him we must endeavor to do so. This means work not only in obtaining the required information, but also in rating correctly the conclusions based on these data, and tact in properly applying our knowledge of racial heritage.

Sometimes such study leads to curious fallacies. Racial groups, for example, are quite convinced that they have as much to give

America as she has to give them. That attitude is at the bottom of indifference to naturalization. There is no danger that America will not appreciate the newcomer's contribution in art, music, folklore, or any other national heritage of value, but there is a very present danger of overrating that contribution. A false scale of values injures the cause of Americanism and the cause of immigrant nationalism. It is the basis of that pseudo-internationalism which spells peril to America. The European peasant, coming to us unlettered and untaught, cannot bring to us the heritage of the art and history of his people any more than an illiterate American mountaineer can carry to the Old World the history, traditions and gleams of America.

There are other factors to remember. Not the point of departure, but the motive of emigration, must be considered. The emigrant may have been the outraged, oppressed victim of his home land, and come to us with nothing but hatred for government in his heart. Our immigration from Russia illustrates this; it is only 2 per cent Russian, 98 per cent other races including Poles, Lithuanians, Finns and Germans. It is not a question of whether a country has had brave and noble men, but whether her people coming to us have the minds and hearts that will enable them to love and adopt our institutions.

There are 100 races or nationalities in America. One-third of our population is foreign by birth or parentage. The character of this element has changed so radically in a generation that thoughtful men are in doubt as to our ability to assimilate them. Several eminent biologists at the Eugenic Conference held in New York last year seriously questioned the truth of the sacrosanct American theory of the "melting pot." Pictures were drawn of large national groups living to themselves and perpetuating the vices of the Old World. In the last generation immigration has come largely from South and East Europe. Our early immigration came from Teutonic stocks able to blend with us, which understood and liked our institutions; it was English, Scandinavian, German, Dutch. It was also Celt with Irish, Scotch and French (mostly by way of Canada), and this element, which already knew our language, was also assimilable. Almost all this old and early immigration was literate. In contrast, the races which formed the bulk of immigration just before the World War were ten times as illiterate as the old immigrant was; at that period we received 500,000 aliens from Russia and Austria-Hungary, the majority of them alien in thought as well as birthplace. The immigration problem of our country lies plainly with these Eastern and Southeastern Europeans ignorant, nationalistically gregarious and often hostile to our Gov-

ernment, under whose protection they have come to live.

Many of the races we have to deal with now, in the period following the war, seem almost new born, for instead of belonging to the old Russian, or Austro-Hungarian group, they belong to the new and well-defined nationalities. Some 400,000 Finns farming in Alaska, Minnesota, Michigan, North and South Dakota, or living in Cleveland, Chicago and New York, now look with pride to an independent and prosperous Finland. Some 45,000 Letts, Lithuanians and Esths, also from the Baltic Peninsula, have had the joy of seeing their home lands gain independence. The new Yugoslavia is represented by 450,000 Croats, 250,000 Slovenes and from 80,000 to 100,000 Serbs formerly resident in Croatia, Bosnia and Montenegro.

We also have some 4,500,000 Poles in America—enough, if gathered together, to fill five such States as Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut and Rhode Island. They are mainly unskilled laborers working on farms and in factories and slaughter houses. The men are hard workers, and often hard drinkers. They live mainly to themselves, take pride in their own language, and show little interest in ours. Few of them are naturalized and few of their children attend public schools. It will take patience to make them understand why we insist on their learning English. Our sympathy with Poland's struggle for freedom has helped the Polish immigrant in his new life here.

Another "new" nationality is represented by the Czechs. Chicago has about 110,000 and New York 60,000 Czechs from Bohemia. Their strong organization, under the national athletic association called the "Sokol" (Falcon), makes for active public co-operation in all community endeavors. The Czechoslovaks make good citizens. Dr. Joseph Stybr in the Czechoslovak Review says that one of the Czechoslovak proverbs is "Sing the praise of him whose bread you eat." Those who have read the Czechlovak Declaration of Independence, given to the world in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, realize that Czechoslovak ideals are very much like our own.

Five-sixths of the Jews in America are Russian Jews. They are essentially a city people. Two-thirds of them are skild workmen. Hard workers in clothing factories, they seem to be immune to consumption and pneumonia and their average death rate is only half that of the average American population. Keen and idealistic, they strive to gain education, and look after their own poor.

Besides this Baltic or Russian group there is a strong Latin element, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese. Some 80,000 Spanish laborers work in West Virginia coal mines and in the industries of Ohio.

New Jersey, New York and Connecticut. About 90 per cent are literate. They belong to the immigrant element that leaves wives and children at home. The Portuguese come to us largely from the Azores. They are among the national groups that travel back and forth like a shuttle between the Old World and the New. Both these Latin elements are far outnumbered by our Italian citizens, large colonies of whom are numbered in our cities. North Italians are educated, skilful workmen; the Southern Italians, whose numbers are constantly increasing, are generally illiterate peasants, and represent one of our great problems.

Greeks we have always had with us. Only the males immigrate mainly for economic reasons. They crowd into over crowded boarding houses, and add to our tenement-house congestion. Gregarious and addicted to the coffee-house habit, they are easily assimilable, and represent another of our problems.

From the Near East there come to us many Armenians, fleeing from the tyranny of the Turk. In New York and its vicinity there are many Syrians, whose main business is trade. They become naturalized and look after their own poor.

Let us refrain from tagging races with characteristics unless we are broadminded enough to feel that the exceptions prove the rule. Not all Poles drink to excess, not all Italians use the deadly stiletto, not all Syrians prevaricate, not all Jews are Reds. Our Jewish soldiers proved themselves good warriors. Italian names were 10 per cent of our casualty list. Fifty per cent of the 30,000 Lithuanian soldiers in our forces were volunteers. The National Croatian Society set a model in its ringing declaration of loyalty. An extended survey of the 100 races would show that, no matter where the race as a whole stood, individual members of all races proved their acceptance of our institutions during the war.

Only four out of every 100 of those eligible for Americanization classes are registered in the evening schools, and the number in industrial classes is negligible. Not the whole 100, but fourteen or fifteen nationalities are probably all that one class teacher will need to study. There need be no fear that the immigrant's racial heritage will be unappreciated. Every school has its social racial nights, when the music, folklore and dancing of the mother country are made part of the entertainment. And if the school fails in due honor to Old World traditions there is always the Social Settlement, concerning which the California report says:

The Social Settlement was the first institution in this land to give practical recognition to the fact that art and philosophy had not departed from the Greek, that music and the sense of legal order had not deserted the Italian, that with the Jew there still

remains a worship of the beauty of holiness, a reverence for pure family life, and a deep-seated belief that a nation which breaks faith is as much a sinner as the individual who does violence to the moral law. The settlement first recognized the valuable contributions that might be made to our culture by immigrants from Germany, from Russia, from England, from France, and from the homes of the Norsemen; yes, even from the pettiest of distant lands.

The settlement houses and racial groups will see to it that due respect is paid to the immigrant heritage; we must see that due respect is paid also to the American heritage of ideas and customs. Especially do we deprecate the attitude of those who wishing to make friends with the foreners, belittle America. We are facing the most tremendous problem any nation ever faced. We must assimilate 100 races, or see our civilization go down, our ideals supplanted by those of other lands, and our institutions honeycombed with alien doctrine. Unless we can help the immigrants to foster national traits that coalesce with ours, and suppress those that are antagonistic to the genius of our institutions, we shall internationalize, instead of Americanize, to the detriment of the immigrant and of ourselves.

IMMIGRATION HYSTERIA IN CONGRESS

BY JOHN E. MILHOLLAND

The Forum, January, 1921

For the first time in the history of this immigrant nation, it has been decided by the Federal House of Representatives that, with three hundred years' wonderful experience behind us we must go out of the Immigration business entirely.

A momentuous step has been taken. And it was taken in haste. Much in fact suggestive of a stampede mard the proceedings. In portions of the debate conditions of mind bordering upon a panic were reflected. To be sure, a certain amount of spontaneity was evidenced, but behind it all the familiar work of propaganda and prearrangement was distinctly visible, as it has been for years. Calm consideration was almost overwhelmed by vociferous demand and excited speech until methods prevailed that shocked the veteran members of a government that is supposed to represent deliberate action, an appeal to reason and a reasoning from sufficient data.

Prest for the cause of so much precipitancy on the part of the Bill's opponents, a leading member of the House declared that he "understood no less than 15,000,000 immigrants" at European ports to be preparing to overwhelm us with their numbers. No positive

trustworthy information was furnished to justify such an amazing declaration, and it was quickly demonstrated that with the existing system of ocean passenger transportation, 15,000,000 people could not be brought here in ten years, tho every ship were loaded to the gunwales and sailed at top speed.

It was shown, moreover, that according to the actual report of the Immigrant Department for the year ending June 30, 1920, exactly one more than 430,000 immigrants arrived and 283,315 went home, leaving an actual increase of 142,686 or less than one-tenth of one per cent in our population. This included people from all countries and all races—African, Chinese, Hebrew, Irish, Japanese, Polish, Russian, Scotch, Slavoc, Spanish, Turkish, and a lot of Mexicans.

Since the close of the last fiscal year, that is since June 30, 1920, there has been this increase in the arrivals: July, 83,959; August, 86,500; September, 98,400; October, 101,000; November, 102,000; or a total of 472,859 for the five months, but over against this there were no less than 181,505 in the way of returns, leaving a net increase of our population of 291,354 or less than three-tenths of 1 per cent; or an indicated total immigration for the current fiscal year 1920-21 of about 700,000, or nearly half a million under the high-water mark of the years preceding the War; practically two-thirds of one per cent of our total population, and far, far below the figures representing our natural increase—usually estimated at one million, at least, annually.

A Teapot Tempest

Viewed in the light of actual statistics—and all these figures are taken from the official reports of the Government—the tide of immigration is certainly running very much below that of former pre-war years. Considered in the light of what was predicted would happen immediately after the close of the World War, they are ridiculously small. In justification of such a drastic piece of legislation, as proposed in the Bill reported by the majority House Immigration Committee, after years of agitation and propaganda, it is enough to make the intelligent citizen rub his eyes in astonishment and wonder what all the fuss is about. It is a teapot tempest, and, for the moment, the splendid calm figure of Columbia seems transformed into the traditional old lady, scrambling over chairs and tables to avoid the real or imaginary mouse.

Why is it among all the great questions that press upon us for solution, that of immigration is the one over which the American people become so easily excited? Immigrants ourselves we should understand it fully, or at least consider it sympathetically.

but we don't, and in consequence even sensible legislators go into hysterics at certain frequently recurring intervals.

The solution of the immigration problem is sumd up in one word—Distribution. Had we given as much time to this simple solution of the question as we have to discussing the evils or dangers that are supposed to lie in its wake, we would be free from all apprehension on the subject. All our troubles over the forener here are due to the disregard of this experience-born injunction. It accounts for all the racial troubles that California and the other Pacific Coast States have had over the Japanese and Chinese. If that contingent of Chinese, mostly of the coolie type, that came from Canton, Peking and the other big Chinese cities about half a century ago, had been judiciously scatterd thru-out the country instead of being permitted to settle down in San Francisco, they never would have become such a disturbing factor in the situation.

This is true of the Hungarians who were brought to the Pennsylvania coal fields and allowd to build up colonies there; of the Italians, the Russians, the Galicians and the Polish Jews who swarm the streets of New York and give it and the other cities of our country the appearance of foren capitals.

The organizations that have undertaken this work of distribution at least are to be commended, and where needed, should have government support to do the work in a systematic, intelligent, practical manner. Here is real genuine service for Congress to perform, and that immediately.

Taking the worst view of it, there is nothing more alarming at present than the wild rumors voiced by Mr. Campbell of Kansas, in the course of the debate of that phantom army of "15,000,000 immigrants" that are resting upon their arms somewhere in Europe to invade us.

Supposing it to be true, instead of being as it is nonsensical—inspired by talk on the part of those at home and abroad who are trying to frighten the American people into cutting off one of our greatest National assets—what is there to be alarmed about. We enter the danger zone, according to Macaulay's famous prediction, only when we have a population of 20,000 to the square mile. At present we have an average of between 30 to 40 people living upon each of the eight million square miles of North America. When that playful prophecy of the brilliant Englishman is fulfilled, we shall have 160,000,000,000, or ten times the population of the whole world, and that will be long centuries hence, for we grow in numbers more slowly than popular supposition has it.

It has taken this old gray earth two thousand years, according

to Mulhall, to increase from 54,000,000, in the days of Julius Caesar, to 1,000,000,000, one reason being that during the Middle Ages the gain in population was so slight that there were less than 50,000,000 in Europe as late as the Twelfth Century.

Our Vast Unoccupied Territories

But if it be necessary to quiet still further the Nation's nerves after this Congressional outburst, let us remind ourselves that we have yet considerable territory desperately in need of occupation. According to the Census returns New York State itself today has no less than 25,000 deserted farms, with little prospect of their being taken up unless foreners do it. The average American boy does not take to manual labor, either in the North or in the East, West or South. It is not exactly that the rising native generation has grown "soft," but because they feel we have reacht the point where they can have this service done by others. In the South there is colord man, in the North and West the immigrant; and if the abandond farms of the East, especially New England, are being taken up a little more rapidly than formerly, or in other States, it is because of the influx of sturdy French Canadians who have come down over the border. They work.

The United States "overwhelmd by 15,000,000 Immigrants"? What nonsense! Consider a few random facts. Texas has about the same acreage as Germany before the war. Its population today is less than 5,000,000 or about one-thirteenth of the old Teutonic Empires but it could take all the people in Germany and the forty millions of France, and then not be so thickly populated to the square mile as the Italy of today.

One hundred and thirty millions of immigrants could settle in the South on the other side of the Mississippi and that whole Southern section would not be one-half so thickly populated as Massachusetts with less than 4,000,000 and with no end of deserted farms—all worth tilling. All the people of Portugal could settle down in Missouri, and Missouri then would be no more crowded than Portugal is at present. The entire South can take care of more than 250,000,000 immigrants without feeling the strain of excessive population. At least, 500,000 people might be sent below the Mason and Dixon's line every year from Ellis Island, and it would take a hundred years at that rate to fill up Dixie, or crowd out the 11,000,000 or 12,000,000 colord people, or close up, for lack of space, a single race-track or baseball field.

A few years ago when one William Hohenzollern attempted to frighten us and the rest of the world with his talk about the "Yellow Peril," or the alleged certainty of Occidental inundation

by Oriental populations, he harpt on these arguments in favor of his imperialistic notions and fool war until a mathematical chap in Philadelphia sat down one day and figured out that if India's entire 300,000,000 people (that is the last official British record) would land some night on the Pacific Coast, and start for Chicago, all of them could be absorbd without a single one going farther East than the Rocky Mountains. Washington, Oregon, California, Idaho, Utah, Montana, and Wyoming could accomodate them all with as much land as they had at home, and each State still be in a position to yell "Come West, young man! Come West!

We are supposed to lead the American continent, if not the whole world, in ability to handle the perplexing problems of civilization, but Argentina and some of the other South American Republics are setting us an example in the way they are handling immigration that is worthy of our consideration. Instead of putting up the bars, they greet the immigrant cordially, attend to his examination just as carefully and far more scientifically than we do, but once admitted they never rest until he is placed where he can be workt to the best advantage for himself and for the country, and in every way given the best possible chance to live up to his blue china."

An argument in favor of this method of treatment of these unfortunate creatures against our barbarous ways was recently set forth in very temperate language by a writer in *The Forum*. It is bound to be in vogue within the near future because this whole question is passing with great rapidity from the realm of academic discussion to the actual requirements of our country.

The Unceasing Cry for Labor

From East to West, the cry of every farmer, every contractor and employer is for labor—labor to sow and to reap and to gather into barns; labor for the public works, the shops, and for a thousand other forms of our activity. This labor must be found somewhere. The North has had a draw from the South. The limit has been reacht, but while a temporary slowdown in manufacture may continue, there is no slowdown in the requirements of the agricultural regions of the United States. People must be fed. Crops must be raisd. The land must be tild. Consumption is overtaking production everywhere, and unless this wholesale rejection of foreners be checkt a situation will confront us not pleasant to contemplate. Andrew Carnegie once said that every immigrant was worth \$5,000 to the country. Checking immigration is a menace to prosperity.

To read the wild talk about the effect of this War upon

immigration from the Old World, one would suppose that we had no history of what has followed preceding conflicts. The Napoleonic wars of a hundred years ago were just as tremendous at that time as the late upheaval, consequent upon the World War. Yet nothing that followed Waterloo had any impressive effect upon our imagination, and the subsequent abortive Revolution of 1848, which stirred Europe from one end to the other, was not made conspicuous by the immensity but by the high character of the Old World exodus, particularly from Germany where immigration, stimulated by a desire to avoid enforced military service, was led by such men as Carl Schurz, General Siegel, and that wonderful man, whom the medical profession of America still delights to honor, Dr. Jacobi.

Few came to us from France following the Peace of Versailles that closed the Franco-German War, because the patriotic French threw themselves into the task of rehabilitating the country just as the Belgians and the Russians and others are doing now. The Russian-Japanese War was quite without effect as a stimulus to any tidal wave of emigrants from either country.

A few months ago there arrived in New York a vessel laden with choice fruits from one of the new Zionist colonies of Palestine. From a strictly commercial point of view, it was a mere incident in the foreign import trade, but to men of vision it was endlessly suggestive; suggestive of the day when these historical regions of Asia shall once more take their place in the world's commerce and the ancient, long forgotten vast tracts—Palestine, Mesopotamia, Nineveh, Babylon—come again under cultivation along the lines of Modern science and with other Old World peoples are finally brought under governments of rational, well ordered democracy.

I said the solution of immigrants could be summed up in one word—distribution, but it requires four to state the remedy for emigration: good government at home. Good government at home means practically the end of that restless universal desire to go abroad. We have seen this in the case of England, Scotland, Holland, Belgium, France and every other country that is governed with even the semblance of real democracy. And we have seen how England's wretched misrule of Ireland through generations caused the Irish people to emigrate literally in millions.

*"A drift of men
Gone over the sea,
A drift of the dead
Where the men should be."*

But through the great Land Purchase Bill, the County Councils revived industry and self-assertion, Ireland's home affairs have of

late years improved to such an extent that emigration has dwindled nearly in proportion to that of the other countries mentioned.

So is it true of Italy, which has arisen from misery to become one of the best governed of modern nations. And, what is the result? Italy's emigration has fallen off like that of France, Spain, or Switzerland.

Think what it will mean when the Balkan states, Greece, Russia, Siberia and China have become reorganized and brought in touch with that modern development which makes Democracy an absolute requirement of any advancing civilization. Immigrants will be in demand in the Old World as well as in the Occident-everywhere.

It is all very well to sift out the undesirables at Ellis Island, Angel Island, and all the other ports of arrival on the Atlantic and Pacific, but it should be remembered that the really dangerous people—those who constitute an actual menace to the Republic—seldom come in the steerage. Occasionally they travel Second Cabin, but usually they are found among the First Cabin passengers. They mean business; they take no chances.

It is not worth while to discuss in detail this whole lamentable piece of legislation—for it is now before that bulwark of the Republic, the Senate. The Bill from beginning to end is an anachronism. It is out of place, out of time. We need every decent immigrant that may come to us. We are losing precisely in proportion as the other new and undeveloped countries of the world are being aroused, reformed, and put upon their financial feet. Within twenty years we shall be advertising for foreigners, just as other nations and even some of our own States and Territories have done already, as a matter of necessity.

The Bill is bad—inexpressibly bad. It should never go on the statute books. I do not believe the Senate will ever pass it. If it does, Mr. Wilson, if consistent with his admirable record on this subject, will veto it. It belongs to the Congressional slag heap.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD SPEECH

of

HON. JAMES V. McCLINTIC

of Oklahoma

In the House of Representatives, Friday, December 10, 1920

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 14461) to provide a protection of the citizens of the United States by temporary suspension of immigration, and for other purposes.

MR. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I feel that the Immigration Committee is entitled to the thanks of this body for bringing in a bill of this kind during the early part of this session. There is an old saying, "a stitch in time saves nine," and this saying, in my opinion, is apropos of the condition that exists in the United States at the present moment with relation to the need of a law which will protect the citizens of this country from the foren immigrants who are fleeing to our shores to escape the heavy taxation in the war-devastated regions of Europe.

Some time ago it was my privilege to visit Ellis Island, not as a member of the committee but as a private citizen interested in obtaining information relative to the situation which exists in that place. I stood at the end of a hall with three physicians, and I saw them examine each immigrant as they came down the line, pulling back the upper eyelid in order to gain some information as to the individual's physical condition. I saw them place the chalk marks on their clothing which indicated that they were in diseased condition, so that they could be separated when they reacht the place where they were to undergo certain examinations. Afterwards I went to a large assembly hall where immigrants came before the examiners to take the literacy test, and the one fact that imprest more than anything else was that practically every single immigrant examind that day had less than \$50 to his credit.

MR. GOLDFOGLE. Will the gentleman kindly yield?

MR. McCLINTIC. I will.

MR. GOLDFOGLE. Will the gentleman recognize the fact that many of the most excellent citizens of this country came here without \$50 in their pocket, made their way, and builded splendidly for the welfare of the country?

MR. McCLINTIC. That may be true; but there is not a member of this House who could have lookt upon that body of immigrants as I did that day but what would recognize that they were weak, small of structure, poorly clad, emaciated, and in a condition which showd that the environment surrounding them in their European homes was indeed very bad.

It is for this reason that I say the class of immigrants coming to the shores of the United States at this time are not the kind of people we want as citizens in this country. It is a well known fact that the majority of immigrants coming to this country at the present time are going into the large industrial centers instead of the agricultural centers of the United States, and when it is taken into consideration that the large centers are

already crowded to the extent that there is hardly sufficient living quarters to take care of the people it can be readily seen that this class of people, instead of becoming of service to the communities where they go, they will become charges to be taken care of by charitable institutions. The week I visited Ellis Island I was told that 25,000 immigrants had been unloaded at that port. From their personal appearance they seem to be the off-casts of the countries from which they came.

The cost of living in the United States has increased several hundred per cent in the last few years. Those who are coming to our shores are not able to speak our language; they only have a small amount of money on hand, and it is only a question of a few weeks until their resources will all be used up. I have been told that there are certain individuals in this country who make it their business to exploit immigrant labor coming from certain countries. The immigrant, realizing that he can not speak our language, naturally turns to a former countryman for help, and instead of enjoying the fruits of his labor a large portion of what he earns is taken from him as a commission for the assistance given him. If the immigrants coming to this country were of a class that sought employment on the farms and were capable and willing to render this kind of service to the Nation, then there would be no reason for this legislation. However, the opposite is true, and instead of becoming producers they at once become consumers, thereby working a hardship on every industry throughout the Nation.

I am sure that the United States Congress has no desire to cast any reflection against the citizens of any country. However, the law of self-preservation is one that must always be observed and respected, and it is for this reason that the American citizen, regardless of the occupation he follows, must be protected from being undermined by this class of people.

The Nation at the present moment is going through a reconstruction period. Thousands in many of the large cities have recently been thrown out of employment. Conditions from many standpoints have been gradually growing worse. The first duty of our country is to provide employment for our own people, and until normal conditions can be restored it will be the part of wisdom to close the doors of our country until every condition can be restored to a normal basis. It is for this reason that I am supporting this bill, and I hope to see it enacted into a law by this Congress.

THE INCOMPARABLE MIGRATION

BY HAROLD KNUTSON

(Majority whip in the United States House of Representatives)

The Outlook, December 29, 1920

The first historic reference to any general migration of a people is found in the twelfth chapter of Genesis, where we are told that Abraham, following the command of God, took his tribe from Haran in Mesopotamia into the land of Canaan.

Since the migration of the Israelites under Abraham there has been a constant movement of people from one part of the earth to another. Until comparatively recent time no governmental restrictions were found necessary to place on wanderers, but as society became more highly organized, and civil and property rights more clearly defined, nation after nation found it necessary to impose such regulations and restrictions as would tend to safeguard the interests of the country to which the immigrant sought admission.

Thus it was necessary for Congress to impose certain passport requirements on persons seeking to enter or leave this country after our entrance into the World War. All who had looked into this subject foresaw a large influx of immigration into this country following the conclusion of peace. The past year has fulfilled this expectation and amply justified the precaution taken by Congress. If anything, I should say that we had rather underestimated the volume of immigration that would set in after the war.

Thus it was necessary.

It is interesting to note how immigration to this country has grown the past one hundred years. I herewith submit a table giving such immigration by decades:

1821-1830	143,439	1861-1870	2,318,824
1831-1840	599,125	1871-1880	2,812,191
1841-1850	1,713,251	1881-1890	5,246,616
1851-1860	2,598,214	1891-1900	3,844,426
1900-1910		8,796,308	

The above figures are extremely interesting, and furnish much food for thought for the student of political economy.

During the past year six hundred thousand immigrants have come here from Europe, most of them from the southern part where we have in the past looked for our cheap and unskilled labor. Today Ellis Island, the main gate of entry into this country, is crowded far beyond its capacity, and as a result it is not possible for our immigration officials to examine each candidate for admission with that care which the best interests of the country demand.

To meet the situation temporarily the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House authorized the chairman, Congressman Albert Johnson, to report out a bill on the first day of the present session that will limit entry into this country to certain near blood relatives in direct line of American citizens and of those who have declared their intention of becoming citizens. The strong features of this bill, which, by the way, is only intended as a temporary stop-gap measure to give the Committee time to work out carefully a permanent immigration law, is that the citizen or the declarant must first make application for the relative's admission, also that a suitable bond may be required of the petitioner to insure that the newcomer will not become a public charge. If the Commissioner of Immigration is satisfied that such relative is likely to prove a desirable acquisition, he may issue a permit under such regulations as he may prescribe. The good features of these provisos are obvious.

In the attempt to mold our opinions and conclusions into the enactment of permanent immigration legislation, careful consideration must be given to several important phases of this great question.

The first of these, of course, is the economic one. Shall we permit hundreds of thousands of unskild laborers to flood our overcrowded cities when the question of employment is already causing us grave concern?

Secondly, shall we give welcome to men whose coming to this country results from a desire on the part of certain foren governments to rid themselves of desperate members of the Red hordes now overrunning Europe?

Of course, in making the final decision we must be fair to those who in good faith, and weary of the old order of life in war-wreckt Europe, are eager to enrol themselves as loyal citizens of the Union.

Last summer I spent three months in Europe, and in the seven countries visited I found this desire on the part of a large number of earnest, energetic persons who, no doubt, would be an asset to our National life.

On the other hand, by investigation, which included discussions of this question with American representatives in the various ports from which our largest immigration comes, also with American consular agents in the interior, led me to believe that certain foren governments most affected by the Red menace were actually helping to finance such immigration to this country.

A short time ago I visited Ellis Island to see for myself the class of immigrants now coming here; and to say that I was ap-

paid by the class we are now getting is stating it mildly. Two other members of Congress accompanied me, and we were agreed that only a very small percentage could be assimilated without lowering our present standard, and that is something we must guard against.

For the most part they were unskilled laborers who would only aggravate the economic life of our already overcrowded cities and the very serious problem of unemployment which now exists in every municipality. Most of these immigrants come from southern Europe, and they had no further plan or ambition than to settle down in large cities, with relatives, and eke out the best sort of living that an uncertain future with lack of training and education could provide them. If there is anything that we should endeavor to prevent, it is this sort of program for those who come here. Our cities are already overcrowded, and unemployment is today a very serious problem with us. Accordingly, by confining immigration to the agricultural class, we could change the situation materially by preventing further congestion in the cities and at the same time increasing agricultural production, which, in turn, would lower the cost of living.

Anarchism thrives and flourishes in the slums of the large cities, where poverty, filth, and squalor go hand in hand. These three conditions are hand maidens of congestion and overcrowding and are fertile soil for the propagation of Bolshevism, Communism, and other doctrines that seek to destroy the present order. While it is doubtless true that many of the Anarchists who come through our gates were of that belief before coming here, I am firmly convinced that a very large percentage of the men and women who express a contempt for constitutional government have joined the forces for world revolution only after bitter economic experiences here. One reason for this is their great disappointment in the country after a few years' residence here. Responsible for this in large measure are the steamship agents who hold out glowing pictures and false hopes, and the more clever of their compatriots, who, having found a pleasing prosperity here, return to their native land with what to them seem like all the earmarks of prosperity, such as modish clothing, plenty of money to all appearances, and an air of elegance which fascinates the gullible.

"Well," argues the dissatisfied one, "If Tony or Jake can accomplish this, why shouldn't we go to America and become rich too?" Perhaps they do not possess the business acumen and great vitality and vision that their successful brothers had who made good here, and after a few unhappy years of living in dark, crowded,

noisy tenements, and slaving in even darker and more loathsome sweatshops or factories, their bitter disillusion determines their affiliation with the Red army.

Somehow or other, they feel that they have been deceived in the promises or vision of the promist land and turn to anarchy to express their contempt for this and all other forms of government.

This is merely one of the results of our stupidity in allowing such over crowding in the big cities.

Reviewing the situation from every angle, I can reach no other conclusion than that immigration to this country for the next few years should be confined almost exclusively to those who would come here with the intention of going onto the land, either as independent farmers or as helpers. It is my judgment that this is the only class that can prove a distinct asset to our National and economic life at the present time.

Mention America to most of the prospective immigrants in Europe, and they mutter "New York." Mention Minnesota, Iowa or Illinois, and they take it that you are talking about some foreign land of which they have never heard.

Thru our American representatives in Europe I believe that special literature giving information of the States where home-making opportunities are to be found should be distributed among those who plan to come here to make their home. If necessary, we could afford actually to help this class of immigrants. Think of the thousands of abandoned farms in the East and South and the millions of acres that lie in the Middle and Far West for the want of some one to work them. What would it not be worth to us in dollars and cents to place all our vacant lands under cultivation?

The land question in many parts of Europe today is aggravating the spirit of unrest that is to be found everywhere on that continent. We can satisfy that craving for land. There is plenty to be had, and there is also plenty of work to be had on our farms and ranches. This would solve the labor problem to a large extent on the farms and result in cheaper production, lowering the cost of living.

I believe the Government should undertake some plan of distributing immigration so that it could be placed to the best possible advantage to this country. A wise policy of distribution would prevent congestion, and the gathering of too many of one nationality in a certain community would be obviated, thereby making their Americanization the easier. A system of distribution must be inaugurated and adhered to if we are to protect ourselves against this onslaught of foreign invasion which not only threatens our

peaceful and economic life, but also the bulwark of democracy as well.

DISTRIBUTION VS. RESTRICTION

HON. ALBERT B. ROSSDALE,

of New York.

In the House of Representatives, Thursday, April 21, 1921

MR. ROSSDALE. Mr. Speaker, I have attentively listened to all of the arguments presented by the gentlemen who favor this bill, which the committee has reported to restrict immigration, and it seems to me that the element of hysteria is the dominating factor which inspires the gentlemen to urge its adoption. It is presented as an emergency measure. What is this emergency? We, who represent districts wherein reside a large number of foren-born persons and hence are or should be best qualified to judge, do not know. And I question and doubt very much if the gentlemen representing mostly agricultural districts, where there are very few foren-born persons and are therefore unfamiliar with immigrants or immigration problems, really know whether or not an emergency exists, and yet, as a result of post-war hysteria, urge the passage of restrictive immigration legislation. It would be amusing, if it were not so tragic in its possibilities, to listen to these alarmist statements of the hordes of prospective immigrants whom, we are told, are ready to inundate this country, and who are supposed to be only awaiting the consular vise and the ship to come here and engulf us all. The figures the gentlemen give vary from two to fifteen millions, despite the known fact that the estimated steamship facilities give the maximum number of persons who could obtain passage to this country from anywhere in the world in the next 12 months as 809,000, and despite the fact which every Member of this House knows from practical experience that our State Department has absolute and perfect control of immigration thru the vise system, and that our State Department has limited and controlled immigration from the moment the vise system went into effect; that the State Department now has and does exercise this power to curtail and to limit immigration to what ever number the judgment of the Secretary of State deems desirable and wise.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I represent a district wherein reside a considerable number of foren-born persons, and I am conversant with the conditions, social, political and economical, which surround them, for I have lived among them in New York from early childhood; worked with them and played with them. I know collectively of their struggles and strivings, of their hopes and aspirations, and I am familiar with their customs and be-

liefs, and manner of their living in our midst, and understand them and all the things they do.

Knowing and understanding immigrants and immigrant life as I do, I believe I am qualified to state that there exists no reason whatsoever for this hysteria to abandon the traditional American policy of an open door to those of Old World's people who present themselves for admission to our country, and who are mentally and physically fit, and who are not anarchists or opposed to our form of government, and who are not in conflict with the rules and regulations applied in the present immigration law.

It would seem by the arguments advanced by the gentlemen favoring this measure that America, with only 105,000,000 population already has reached the saturation point, and that there is no more room in this country for any more desirable persons who may want to come to our shores. Does anyone here really believe that our country with its vast territory can not support a further increase in population? Gentlemen, when the time shall come that our country will really face overcrowding, then we shall all advocate closing the gates; but so long as there are vast territories of unoccupied and vacant lands smilingly turned to the sunshine awaiting men with willing hands to till and produce, so long should our beloved country be the door of hope and remain the fair land of opportunity to all the oppressed races of the Old World.

It is possibly true that there is a tendency of immigrants to crowd into the larger cities and into the more settled and crowded centers, but that is not the fault of the immigrant, and it is solely due to the peculiar conditions applying to persons coming to what is to them a strange land. Naturally, they drift to and locate in those places where there are others of their countrymen; to those who have preceded them in coming here, and from whom they can obtain aid, comfort, and advice, and with whom they can enjoy social activities such as they are accustomed to; and where there are churches, temples, and synagogues where they can worship the Deity in the manner in which they are accustomed. Is it not reasonable to assume that strangers in a new land will settle where there are others of their kind, who speak their language and understand their customs, especially in the beginning, when they are in urgent need of some one to assist them to tide over the helpless greenhorn stage? This function of assisting immigrants to become established is usually assumed by relatives or friends, and these relatives or friends generally locate them in the large industrial centers, where opportunities for employment seem ever ready and where there is always a demand for employment in occupations that native-born Americans do not readily or generally

desire. Besides, employment in such places does not generally involve separation of family groups, and for this reason is more desirable to the immigrants.

If, then, the immigration question is one of congestion in the cities and populous centers—and I am in accord with the gentlemen whose protest is against the continuation of the stream of foreign-born persons to our large cities—it is rather a question of distribution and regulation and not restriction, and the logical action for Congress is to enact constructive legislation that will divert arriving immigrants to the desired localities. That would substitute congressional common sense for legislation emergency hysteria—sound business judgment for the Nation and better living conditions for immigrants. The Commissioner General of Immigration, W. Y. Hubbard, recently appointed by President Harding, upon accepting this important post gave the country an expression of his views in which he recommended such a policy as the only practical solution of the problem. He is competent to speak and advise on this subject, because he is a student and scientist who has specialized upon immigration and has had years of practical administrative experience in handling these problems. Would it not be wiser for the Members of this House to instruct the Commissioner General of Immigration, under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, to formulate a plan to regulate and control the distribution of immigrants along scientific lines, and then have the committee report out a new bill based upon some such plan?

The bill reported out of committee limits the arrival of immigrants to 3 per cent in any fiscal year of the number of foreign-born persons of such nationality as were resident in the United States in the year 1910. Why 1910 is selected as the year basic instead of 1920 I do not know. Congress appropriated and the Census Bureau expended a large sum of money upon the 1920 Census.

We are informed that the tremendous cost of this census and the enormous number of persons engaged and the labor involved will make it the most perfect and complete census of any people in the history of civilized man, and yet the committee rejected it and insistently demand the now obsolete 1910 census for a base, and tell us this is an emergency and that we can not even wait another 24 hours, when the 1920 census will be ready. Only a few days ago this House passed an emergency tariff bill, which we were assured would make everybody in the United States, except those few who were engaged in the import trade, prosperous, successful, and happy. It was admittedly not a scientific bill, but as it was explained, an emergency measure, to tide us over a pressing emergency

period. We accordingly passt it; and now, lo and behold, here is another emergency bill. It would seem to me that either there are many emergencies in Washington or else some of the gentlemen's nerves are overwrought. Happily, in my district, the Bronx, folk are quite calm.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, far more important than all the reasons I have set forth against the adoption of this harsh and hasty legislation is a moral reason. For this bill, if passt, will prevent and bar American soldiers from bringing their blood relations who may be in other countries from joining them in the United States. Can we lightly pass such a law without considering its resulting effect upon the many thousands of American soldiers who in the Nation's hour of need rendered such gallant services in the late World War and who will be denied the privilege they may want and should be entitled to of bringing their loved ones who are yet in other lands to join them here?

When the call came "to make the world safe for democracy" 4,000,000 Americans answered, and by their service and sacrifice these 4,000,000 of the "flower of our youth" did their best to "make the world a better place in which to live." We made no partition then between native-born or foren-born; we simply called them all, and they responded in a like manner. Among these 4,000,000 were hundreds of thousands of foren-born who under the terms of this bill will be unable to bring to this country to join them their fathers or mothers, brothers or sisters, fiancées or blood relations. Is America so crowded that there is not room in it for a soldier's near kin? "Over there" in Belgium and France lie sleeping beneath the rows of crosses and six-pointed stars many foren-born Americans who have kept faith. Have we the moral right to exclude the father, mother, sister, or brother of any of these men? Is it not for America also to keep the faith? It is an old, old cry "keep the forener out." It began way back in the long ago. The Puritan fathers used it against those who did not conform exactly to their standards. Roger Williams, fleeing from it, found a safe haven at Providence, and all through the years in every generation forces have arisen against the newcomer. In every instance, however, the sober common sense and clear reasoning and generous spirit of the American people prevailed and the adventurous peoples of the world and those fleeing from intolerance and oppression were permitted to come here to do their part and have a share in the upbuilding of the Nation.

THE MENACE OF MIGRATING PEOPLES

EDWARD ALSWORTH ROSS

The Century Magazine, May, 1921

In 1868 Anson Burlingame negotiated a treaty in which the United States of America and the Emperor of China cordially recognized "the inerrlant and inalienable right of man to change his home and his allegiance." Fourteen years later our Chinese exclusion Act made a jest of this fine flourish of American political idealism. It has now become apparent that there are other sociological lessons our people will have to learn under the harsh tutelage of facts.

In the past the chief guaranty of stability in the relations of races and peoples has been human inertia. Most men lived and died within a few leagues of their birthplace. Under the empire of habit they bore their lot, be it never so hard, without reflecting that a brighter life might be awaiting them overseas. Only the exceptional were gifted with the imagination and courage to pluck up and wander forth in the hope of bettering their condition.

But this molluscan stage is not likely to last much longer. Since the birth of men now living, the conditions of the mass movement of peoples have been utterly revolutionized. Not only has steam on land and sea made travel swift and safe and cheap but the long distance carriage of human beings has been organized as never before. Today a peasant living within sight of the rock of Prometheus or the cedars of Lebanon may buy a thru ticket to a frontier point in the Canadian Northwest. For the sake of the profit to be extracted from them, penniless laborers are gathered, despatched and cared for during their long journey to a destination on the other side of the globe as if they were commercial wares.

In the villages of southwestern Asia passenger-tickets to some remote zone of opportunity are hawked about as newspapers and apples are cried on our streets. The seller will not only incite the peasant to migrate, but will take a mortgage on his home for the passage-money or accept the bond of some relative that the immigrant will within a year remit the sum advanced. Parties of "greenhorns", thrubild from their native village by a professional money-lender, are met at the right points by his confederates, coacht on the answers to make to the immigration authorities, and deliverd finally to some "board-

ing boss" in this country who is recruiting labor on commission for a construction gang.

Besides such means of detaching the limpet from his rock, local adhesions are everywhere being loosened by the spread of the capacity to read and by the prodding of minds of the masses by the newspapers.

So, for better or worse, we have entered on the era of facile migration. No longer is population rooted like a tree in its natal soil. Mankind delinquesces and flows in broad streams toward any place on earth which holds out the prospect of a better living. This readiness of petty folk to up and away on slight inducement is a new thing, but there is no reason to suppose it a passing phenomenon. On the contrary, so far as we can look ahead, the means and desire of removing from one's native land to another will grow. The collecting and forwarding of human beings will become a business and, like many other businesses, it will be pushed.

To-day every people desires to be a nation, that is, spiritual unit. In the Roman Empire this ideal played no part and there resulted an amazing hodgepodge of population. We moderns are afraid of such collections of human odds and ends as came to people Roman Africa or Syria or the valley of the Nile, because we realize that always such muddled mixing begets absolutism in government. Dreading a government not subject to the collective will of the government, we wish a people of common opinion upon political questions. When private conduct and public authority are obedient to public, a nation is almost able to dispense with coercion. Furthermore, spiritual oneness prevents the rise of caste barriers to association and intermarriage.

Now, cheap travel and full steerages make mock of this ideal of nationality. Any prosperous country which leaves its doors ajar will presently find itself not the home of a nation but a polyglot boarding-house. The thriving areas of the world will come to be populated by a confused party-colored mass of diverse languages and religions and of the most discordant moral and economic standards. Coolies at the breech-clown stage of attire, such as you find in the back districts of the Far East, will jostle the descendants of Puritans. The enlightening will perforce brush shoulders with idolators, wearers of amulets, and believers in the evil eye. In the same labor market will compete those who sit at meat and those who squat on their heels about a bowl of food, those who insist on a

carpet underfoot and those content with a dirt floor, those who honor their wives and those who make them chattels, those who school their children and those who exploit them.

Invariably, when elements with such incompatible traditions intermingle, castes form; so that the nation which persists in welcoming all inoffensive comers presently find its people going as under closed groups. The fact is becoming so easy that any nation which is economically well off has to choose whether it will see caste barriers in it or will itself rear a barrier against nonassimilable aliens.

In the masses of the Orient, which steam has made next-door neighbors of ours, the family customs and the status of women are such that land shortage, overcrowding, and economic stress have no appreciable effect in checking the flow of babies. With these folk economic necessity does not prompt to birth control. If the excess of births over deaths cannot be taken care of by the improvement of agriculture or the rise of factory industry and export trade, and the people cannot migrate, then the growth of the local population is accompanied by deepening poverty and misery until mortality rises to such a degree that human beings die as fast as they are born. At this point population is in equilibrium, and conditions need not become worse. This is "the stationary state" which the greater part of the Asiatics seem to have reached centuries ago.

Within a generation, thanks to science's conquest of disease and to the improvement of public sanitation, the deathrate of the more enlightend peoples has been cut in two. In Norway or New Zealand, for example, not over eightieth of the population die in a year. Now, the application of these new means of saving human lives is upsetting in the Orient the ancient balance between births and deaths. The West, to be sure, sets the example of a low birth-rate as well as a low death-rate; but the influences which pull down the death-rate come into operation in the Orient much earlier than those which pull down the birth-rate. India and China get pure water, hospitals, antitoxins, serums, and modern medicine before later marriages for girls, the emancipation of wives, obligatory school attendance, and birth control practices become establish among them. During this critical interval, when Asiatics born at the high Oriental rate are dying only at the low Occidental rate, population will tend to increase rapidly, and the surplus, becoming mobile under modern inducements to migrate, will move toward

any part of the world which promises an easier existence.

Various influences have spared western Europe the grim experience of the stationary state Asia has had. She never reduced her women to the hopeless lot of most Oriental women. Her access to the New World afforded relief from the pressure of numbers. Improvement in the industrial arts, especially in the last century and a half, allowed population to grow without making life harder. The impending delinquescence of peoples, particularly of the congested and free-multiplying Asiatics, therefore opens to the Europeans and the descendants of Europeans who find themselves in conditions of comparative comfort in the younger regions of the world a truly appalling prospect of a human deluge.

Nor is this all. Within the last half-century a most hopeful tendency has shown itself in some parts of western Europe, in Australasia, and in North America. With the penetration of intelligence and individualistic democracy to the broader layers of the people, there appears a phenomenon which rarely, if ever, has shown itself before on any large scale. This is adaptive fecundity, or a birth-rate accommodated to the economic outlook for the next generation.

When foresight and self-control in respect to family size have become general, a people is in the way of attaining a degree of comfort and enjoyment of life such as can never be enjoyed for long by a people of blind fecundity. For its growth is regulated by its standard of living, and with every improvement in agriculture or industry it raises its standard of living instead of allowing the slack to be taken up by mere increase of numbers. No limit can be assigned to the possible amelioration of the lot of the masses when they are canny enough to "salt down" their economic gains in higher standards of living rather than in rearing big families.

Once a people adapts its production of children to the economic prospect, the free inflow of blindly fecund immigrants has a most calamitous effect upon its self-perpetuation. Sensing the curtailment of its children's chances, it withholds offspring in just the degree that the alien element expands. In handing on the torch of life it seems to act on the principle, "After you, my dear Alphonse!" For this behavior the writer coined twenty years ago the phrase "race suicide" which unfortunately has come to be applied to every form of prudence in the matter of family.

For a people which has arrived at an adaptive birth-rate to

admit the surplus population begotten by other peoples which multiply without taking thought for the morrow is virtually to cut its own throat. To vary the metaphor, once the camel has been allowed to put his head into the tent, the process of displacement goes on quietly, but inexorably, until the camel is the sole occupant of the tent. It is a painless death, to be sure, which extends over a century or two and proceeds without clash or scandal, but no people which foresees it will adhere to the fatal policy of the open door.

Prudence in progeny is so much the product of circumstance and accident that it would be absurd to claim that its practitioners are ipso facto superior types, whereas the prolific peoples are inferior. Nevertheless, it is certain that the bright races will be the earliest to look ahead and limit the size of the family, while the dullard races will be the last to abandon the blind fecundity to become general among mankind, unhindered immigration, by favoring the blind breeders at the expense of the prudent breeders, would enable the stupid and inert peoples to poach on the preserves of the bright and aspiring peoples. Since the latter will not allow themselves to be allowed off the earth themselves by the superfluous children of the former, it is certain that every advanced nation will rear immigration barriers. Dogmas of the Open door and the melting-pot become absurd in a time when population rolls hither and thither about the globe like particles of quicksilver.

The barriers with which each national comfort area will endeavor to surround itself will not obstruct the passage of culture or culture-bearers. Travelers, officials, students, scholars, merchants, and artists will be able to go anywhere without molestation. It is only the broad masses that will be hindered from migration.

One reason for the hesitation of this and other nations about joining in a league of nations is dread of losing control over immigration. Since every people has an interest in the immigration policy of any people, a strong effort will be made in the interest of world peace to have all disputes between governments arising out of immigration submitted to arbitration. This however, would tend to the equalization of peoples and races in rights of admission to each country, and would thereby prevent a people discriminating among the streams of immigrants which

offer themselves. But, it is likely that immigration barriers will be even more jealously reserved from international control than tariff barriers have been.

Will the crowded and blindly multiplying peoples tamely submit thus to be excluded from areas on which they might unload surplus population? May they not make the rearing of such dikes a *casus belli*? Even now the Japanese show themselves restive in the presence of anything which savors of exclusion, and it is not hard to foresee a time when the peoples of India and China and Siam and Egypt may challenge the barriers which keep them out of all the more desirable markets for their labor.

Nevertheless, while the overpopulous nations are certain to become aware and resentful of exclusion, as at once an unjust handicap and an imputation of inferiority, the number of peoples resolved to withdraw from the game of competitive fecundity constantly grows. We have seen Canada, Australasia, South Africa, and several South American republics come into line with the United States in the matter of immigration. As the dense populations become more mobile, the sense of pressure will grow until perhaps, Europe will make common cause with the younger societies in recognizing in international law the right of every nation to surround itself with such immigration barriers as seems good to it. Whether the pullulating peoples will acquiesce in any such principle is on the knees of the gods. It may be that the most terrific of all wars, which would involve, no doubt, the entire human race, will be fought on this issue.

ANTHROPOLOGY AND IMMIGRATION

ALBERT EDWARD JENKS

University of Minnesota

(From an address before the American Association for the Advancement of Science.)

Mr. Fredrick A. Wallis, Immigration Commissioner at the port of New York, recently said that the greatest problem before America today is the Immigration Problem. The whole nation is coming to a realization of the truth of this statement. The seriousness of the problem is equalled only by our lack of data, our lack of methods and technique, our general ignorance in dealing with it. Ferrero, the Italian historian, recently said:

My first surprise (on coming to the United States), and a very great one it was, arose from my examination at close

quarters of the policy pursued by the United States in dealing with the immense hordes of immigrants who yearly pour into their harbors from all parts of the Old World.

This question was of special interest, as he said, "to a historian of Rome like myself to whom history has taught the great internal difficulties which were caused in every ancient state by the *"metoipoi"* or *"peregrini"* (i. e., aliens). This great problem of the admission, the distribution, and the assimilation of the immigrant in America is at base anthropological.

Out of the physical man grows the psychic man. As out of these different physical characteristics of the different breeds of people come the psychic characteristics of those breeds of people, it should be expected that the reactions of the different breeds of people would exhibit differences. The practical handler of peoples knows such is the case, whether he is an administrator of colonies, a policeman in any large cosmopolitan city, or boss of a gang of mixt "foreners" on any American railway job. At the present moment it cannot be said that these differing reactions of the different breeds of men are due to physical differences, or to psychic differences, or to social and cultural differences, or to something yet unnamed. All that is known is that different breeds commonly posses distinguishing reactions in many of the affairs of life.

The American immigration problem is centered in the various breeds of people who are clamoring to come to our shores or who are already in our midst. What facts and tendencies of strength and weakness for the future of the American nation are in those various ethnic groups. On the answer to this question hangs the whole immigration problem. It is a question for the most careful study, the accumulation of accurate data, and for effort at scientific conclusions on the part of anthropologists in order that an intelligent public opinion based on known facts, instead of sentiment, or prejudice or commercial profits for the few, may dictate our policies and practice in regard to the peoples coming to us or already here. Some peoples can, do, and will continue to build into the American plan of development. Others do not, and should not be expected so to develop without due education and often tedious application. Others probably never would. We must have a public opinion on this question based on scientific facts as to the relative assimilability of the various peoples already here, and also on the actual attitude of the leaders of the several groups towards the necessary American goal of rapid and complete assimilation.

If further immigration is to be allowed and encouraged, the national policy should welcome those groups most favorable to assimilation, and should restrict those unfavorable.

So also in the problem of the distribution of immigrants in America wise use should be made of anthropological data. Practically each one of the peoples coming to us from Europe has lived for many generations in one type of environment in many cases has pursued one kind of employment, so it has developed rather fixed reactions which have saved it. The anthropologist should be able to put at the service of the nation such knowledge of European environments and peoples, and of American environmental areas that the different immigrant peoples could be sent to, or educationally advised to go to, those areas and employments most likely to prove helpful rather than injurious to the immigrating generation.

Let me cite a few illustrations of immigrant distribution personally known to me. A group of well-to-do Holland-Dutch farmers was brought as entire families with some thousands of dollars each from the wet alluvial lands of Holland, and planted in the sand of a northern Minnesota county on farms previously selected for the colony. Those families did not know how to farm on land which leaches dry in a few hours after a light rain, and which during the hot growing period of July and August could profit by heavy rains every other day. In ten year's time the members of that colony of industrious and hopeful immigrants who came to us prosperous farmers are scattered, their accumulations wasted, and disillusioned, they work for a wage where they can find it.

Between 1850 and 1860 a small group of Finns came from the copper mines of Sweden to northern Michigan to work in the Calumet and Hecla mines. Since that time, and particularly since 1900, northern Michigan and especially northern Minnesota have attracted many Finns from Finland. I know well their homes in Minnesota. There they find as nearly as well may be an environment identical with that of Finland. It is a heavily glaciated area with ridges of drift strewn with immense boulders. Glacial lakes, marshes, and small streams are everywhere. The forest is "Canadian" and identical with that of Finland. Other peoples, even the Scandinavians, have passed by these rough lands with their ridges and marshes, which the Finns actually seek out. There they continue to settle, clear the forests and make small farms. They are productive immi-

grants, happy and successful in their own sort of familiar climate, forests, soil, and country life. I know some of them who are joyous on those farms after having lived some years in the hustle of our Twin Cities. The Finns found their own environment by accident.

The German-Russians also by accident went to the open plains of the Dakotas, and there in areas so like their Russian farms they have become contented and many are wealthy farmers. The chief adjustment they had to make was to larger farms, and American citizenship and language. While around many of the extensive mines and plants of our fundamental industries the Slavic-Russians are struggling to adjust themselves from the open-air life of the Russian farms to the intense, breathless life of the industrial gang. Many of these Slavs have been as misplaced as were the Holland-Dutch. With care and study we put our imported plants and animals in the areas to which they are best adapted, but we allow the peoples coming to us to go where chance or material profit for the moment leads them.

The results of anthropological and environmental researches in Europe and America could be so popularized as to become important factors in the matter of immigrant distribution, and so assist in checking the growing and fatal disease of urbanization in America.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF IMMIGRATION

Mr. Siegel and Mr. Sabath, from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, submitted the following

Minority Views

December 8, 1920

The undersigned members of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization dissent from the report of the majority of the committee on H. R. 14461. The bill was introduced on Monday, December 6, 1920. Altho there was a desire for a hearing in opposition to this measure, and an opportunity was asked for the presentation of facts bearing thereon, a hearing was refused. The report of the majority of the committee favoring the enactment of this bill only became accessible to us on Tuesday, December 7, 1920. In the short time that has been allotted for the presentation of the minority report we are therefore constrained to present our objections with extreme brevity and are of necessity limited in the presentation of facts.

The purpose of the bill is to prohibit practically all immigration for a period of two years. This is so drastic a change in the historic policy of the United States as to be startling. Immigration practically began a century ago. During that time the doors of opportunity have been kept open. Men and women of various nationalities have been welcomed here and they have become incorporated in our population. Without them the United States would not have reached the development of its resources or that degree of prosperity that has been achieved. They have added valuable elements to American citizenship. It is well known that a large proportion of Americans are either immigrants or the descendants of immigrants of the first and second generations.

They will be found among the leaders in the commercial, industrial, and professional activities of the United States. The ranks of labor, skilled and unskilled, have been recruited by them. They have added intellectual, moral, and spiritual values as well. They have done their share in the national defense. During the Civil War they fought for the preservation of the Union, and during the great conflict that has just been waged they constituted a large proportion of those who served in our Army and Navy.

From August, 1914, until the present year immigration was practically suspended because of the war and of the lack of transportation. Although the exact data are not at this moment accessible to us, it will be found that during the same period emigration from the United States reached a very high figure, so that covering a period of six years the number of emigrants from the United States about equaled the number of immigrants. In the meantime the demand for man power in practically all of the American industries has been greatly increased and can not be met except through the medium of immigration, particularly that of unskilled labor.

There is, therefore, no occasion for the extraordinary haste manifested in the attempt now made to enact this prohibitory measure without giving to it the consideration and deliberation that its importance demands. Nothing can be more unfortunate than legislation inspired by hysteria.

The majority report shows that it was not until July, 1920, that there developed a perceptible flow of immigration. Much is made of the fact that in that month the number of immigrants arriving at Ellis Island was 55,900, in August 57,874, in

September 70,052 and in October 74,665. As against these arrivals the departures in September were 35,689 and in October 25,597. These are not abnormal figures. The total immigration from January 1 to December 31, 1920, was 840,509. The total number of departures from the United States during the same period was 366,915. The net immigration, therefore, during the period of 11 months was 473,594. Prior to 1914 there were a number of years in which the net immigration exceeded 1,000,000, and there was no difficulty in absorbing this influx.

The majority have in their report, as we believe, unfairly selected three days for the purpose of showing that on them a large number of immigrants arrived at Ellis Island. That is not a proper test. But even if it were indicative of the average number of arrivals, which it certainly is not, the total number per annum would not exceed the number of immigrants arriving here annually for a series of years prior to 1914.

Apparently the committee was impressed by the fact that, when it visited Ellis Island on a recent occasion, it was found that the number of inspectors stationed there was insufficient to attend to the immigrants with sufficient expedition and that as a result there was a congestion of aliens. The remedy for this state of affairs, that has frequently been called to the attention of Congress, is not to prohibit immigration. It is rather to improve the administration of our existing immigration laws. Long before the war it was well known that the number of inspectors, examining physicians, clerks, and interpreters was inadequate, that the compensation that was paid to those who had been provided was insufficient to procure the high degree of efficiency called for by the duties imposed by the law. The bill as reported makes no attempt to relieve these conditions. No consideration is given even to the subject of creating a sufficient staff of inspectors and physicians to serve along the Canadian and Mexican borders. There are 76 points of entry along our northern boundary. There are only 23 examining physicians there at the present time to perform the duties imposed upon them by the statute, altho it is estimated that 12,000,000 are passing to and from Canada annually.

As bearing on the subject of administration, one of the subscribers has for a long time urged the abolition of the office of commissioner of immigration at Ellis Island and the assignment there of an Assistant Secretary of Labor, in order that appeals may be promptly passed upon. The delays that are now

occasioned because of the loss of time in transmitting appeals to Washington are intolerable. They are unfair to the Government as well as to the immigrants. By adopting the plan proposed, much of the existing congestion could be eliminated and substantial economies introduced. It is obvious that under the existing methods a considerable clerical force is required, both at Ellis Island and in Washington, to attend to the correspondence occasioned by the appeals taken that might otherwise be dispensed with.

There has been and is no reason for the inadequate policy of administration at Ellis Island that has been pursued in the past and for necessitating the transaction of business there in a manner which is necessarily inefficient because of the lack of inspectors and physicians. Under the present law it is contemplated that every immigrant shall be examined by two physicians, but in a large number of cases this can not be done because of the lack of an adequate staff. Congress has failed to make the necessary appropriations, overlooking the fact that the United States has collected in head taxes in the past nine years from immigrants that have arrived here approximately \$11,000,000 in excess of all appropriations heretofore made by Congress for the enforcement of the immigration laws, including all administration expenses. The theory on which the head taxes have been levied has been that they should be devoted to an effective supervision of the arriving immigrant and to his protection against exploitation.

The reason for the increase head tax was to effectuate these purposes.

Yet the immigrants have been made the source of revenue without regard to the crying need for improved methods of administration.

The majority report calls attention to the fact that many of the new immigrants are not such as might go to the farms and that a large proportion of them were bound for cities. The exclusion of these immigrants would not tend to solve the problem of urban and rural distribution. That affects our present population due to immigration. The subject is one that requires careful and scientific study. It can not be disposed of by the rule of thumb. The committee has not attempted to enter upon such a study. On the same theory all of our problems might be met after a fashion by a policy of prohibition. It is intimated in the majority report that in some of the cities named there is un-

employment and a lack of housing facilities. There is no evidence to warrant the statement that a state of unemployment exists except sporadically or voluntarily. On the contrary there is everything to indicate that there is sufficient opportunity for employment for those who desire it, thruout the country. So far as housing facilities are concernd, there is every indication that the artificial restraints against building that have to a large measure been the cause for such dearth of housing as has existed are rapidly disappearing, and to some extent will be diminishd thru immigration.

The majority report refers to estimates that have been made that from 2,000,000 to 8,000,000 Europeans are seeking to migrate to the United States. There is nothing in the report or otherwise to warrant these estimates. It is well known that men are given to exaggeration. Congress should not act on this kind of evidence. A man seated at his desk in Washington or New York, ignorant of European conditions, can just as easily estimate the number of immigrants at 10,000,000 in a single year as at one tenth that number. The utter absurdity of the estimates, is however, apparent on its face, and the majority report very properly refers to it as "idle."

The majority report is especially unfortunate in its reference to the number of Jewish immigrants arriving in this country. Classification according to the religion or race of immigrants is without justification. It is opposed to that Americanism that prevaild in the past. The data containd in Appendix A attacht to the report are at the most exparte statements very likely based upon information furnisht by prejudiced and unfriendly local authorities.

The inaccuracy of the generalizations becomes at once apparent to those familiar with conditions. Speaking of the immigrants from Poland, it is said "that immigrants of similar class are to be found already in the United States who, taken as a class and not individually, have proven unassimilable." The splendid record and conduct of the 3,000,000 of immigrants of that nationality who are now in this country amply refute that charge.

While it is true that, since last July, a considerable number of immigrants have come to the United States from Eastern Europe, that is due to the fact that, before the outbreak of the European war, members of the families of these immigrants, in many instances the head of the household or the supporting

member of the family, had come to this country for the purpose of establishing a home, with the expectation of having the members of the family who had been left abroad rejoin them as soon as possible. The intervention of the war made this impossible until communication was once more restored. As soon as that occurred there was a laudable effort on the part of the members of the families who had arrived in this country to bring about a reunion of the broken family circles. Hitherto this practice has been encouraged. It has been regarded as in the public interest. The majority report, however, seeks to decry this natural demonstration of love and affection, of duty and humanity.

It is insinuated that a Polish labor commissioner has stated that 225,000 Jews "have been furnished this year with funds for passage to the United States." If the inference is sought to be deduced that any moneys have been thus supplied in violation of the immigration laws, it is utterly unfounded. We are reliably informed that no moneys have been spent abroad except by members of the family residing in the United States to those of the same family residing abroad, in order to enable the latter to be reunited with those who had legitimately come to the United States in advance. To forbid such action would not only be brutal, but would not be tolerated by any right-thinking citizen. If there has been any violation of the law, it can be easily ascertained and prosecuted. We are confident, however, that the most careful investigation would disclose that whatever has been done for the relief of the distressed in eastern Europe has been most laudable. It would be a sorry day in American history if our country, that has heretofore been an asylum for the persecuted, were to slam its doors in the faces of those who have been and continue to be the victims of oppression, persecution, and discrimination in the lands in which they live. When the literacy test was adopted, an exception was made as to its application in the cases of those who were subjected to discriminatory laws and regulations, as well as to overt acts of persecution because of their race and religion.

A reading of the majority report would lead one to believe that this truly American policy is to be departed from and that the very fact that a people has been subjected to suffering of an unexampled character should be made the basis of adverse legislation. Thus the majority has called attention to the fact that 80 per cent of the passengers coming on the steamship Rotter-

dam and 90 per cent of those coming on the New Rochel are Jews. We are creditably informd that is due to the fact that those steamers saild from ports which were accessible to the Jews coming from the various parts of Poland; Just as the immigrants arriving on steamers leaving from Italian ports bring Italians, and those from Scandinavian ports those of Scandinavian descent. Representative Siegel had occasion to speak to many of the immigrants arriving on the Rotterdam in the presence of three other members of the committee. He found that practically all of them were women and children who were coming to this country to rejoin the heads of their families and other near relatives in the United States. The children were especially intelligent and would unquestionably within a very brief period be thoroly assimilated.

The allusions to the Jews containd in the majority report are offensive, altho we can not believe that they are intentionally so.

We would not refer to these allusions were it not for the fact that they have a tendency to create in this country at atmosphere of prejudice against all immigrants and because of the further fact that there has recently been conducted a secret and malicious propoganda designd to arouse prejudice against the Jews in various parts of the United States.

We point to the fact that altho the Jewish population of the United States does not exceed 3,000,000, not less than 225,000 Jews servd in the Army and Navy of the United States during the late war, thus supplying a quota much greater than their numbers would have required. They servd honorably and faithfully. Jews of New York composed the "Lost Battalion," which achievd immortality in the Forest of Argonne.

At the time war was declared many of the advocates of the proposed legislation feared that on account of the numerous races and nationalities in America we would not present a united front to the common enemy. The war showd that altho there might have been newcomers from Italy, Poland, Ireland, Czechoslovakia, and many other European countries they had become fighting Americans. They enterd each battle determined to win. They fought side by side with the native born and demonstrated their loyalty to their adopted country.

We are opposed to this bill because it is based on unsound premises, because it is unnecessary, and because it will inevitably prove injurious to the public welfare. The creation of such a pre-

edent as it affords will tend to legislation productive of isolation and to the retardation of our national growth.

So far as the national prosperity of the country is concerned, this bill is bound to injure the mass of our workers who are skild. It is admitted by every fair-thinking American that what we need in this country is the so-called common labor. Again, the average American does not compete with what we call the unskild laborer. Most of the work requiring the exertion of brawn and muscle has been furnisht chiefly by the immigrant. Under this bill the unskild laborer will not be allowd to enter. The skild laborer can come in. This is a fact which should interest every employer and employe, as we know that the skild laborer will not desert his position in order to do unskild work. Where the unskild worker is to come from will become a serious problem, should the bill pass.

The bill is likewise objectionable in that section 4, which is intended to permit certain persons to be brought into the United States, provides that only a citizen of the United States 21 years of age or over who may secure such permission under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor, and then he is permitted only to bring his parent, grandparent, an unmarrid son under 21 years of age, an unmarrid or a widowed daughter, a grandson under 16 years of age whose father is dead or unmarrid, or a widowd granddaughter whose father is dead. It does not even allow him to bring his wife.

The bill is further objectionable in that it makes the Secretary of Labor the sole judge as to whether a person shall be admitted. He must be satisfied that the relative is likely to prove a desirable resident of the United States, and in that event he may issue a permit to the applicant under such regulations as he may prescribe which shall authorize the immigration officers at the port of entry to examine such relative upon arrival at such port. In other words, instead of creating a legislative standard of admission, the entire subject of admission becomes one of special favor. If there is anything that should be avoided in American legislation it is that of making the right to enter the United States a matter of discretion on the part of an administrative officer instead of a matter to be regulated by the Congress of the United States.

ISAAC SIEGEL.
ADOLPH J. SABATH

DIGEST OF VARIOUS ARTICLES

Affirmative and Negative

The 3% law is an attempt to have an invariable solution for a variable problem.

"The Countries from which these people come are hot-beds of radicalism and discontent, fostered by disease, unemployment and lack of food."

Immigrants are naturally agriculturists. More than one-third were engaged in agriculture in their native lands. Intensive farming appeals to them.

The character of the incoming alien body remains practically the same as it was in 1914. In that year, more than four-fifths were southern and eastern Europeans.

Our emigration is approximately one-third of the immigration. Most of the emigrants have stayed here five years without becoming citizens; not being citizens they are not a real loss.

Before the Great War we were receiving over a million immigrants a year; since the war only a little over one-third as many. Looks like some people were scared before they were hurt.

No records of immigration were kept until 1820. After that records were kept but there was no legislation till 1864. The Know Nothing party opposed immigration in the early fifties but secured no legislation.

The covenant of the League of Nations proposes that emigration of workers from one country to another be permitted only after the consent of the organizations of employers and employees of both countries.

We exploit immigrants because we permit them to be exploited. We are responsible for the laws under which it is done. We have never had an immigration law that was honestly and efficiently enforced; and we never had one that was justly enforced.

Two year prohibition of immigration is inexpedient, because there is no virtue in a two year period, and because the law as proposed is too drastic in effect, while on the other hand the welfare of America and her industries demands the immigrant worker.

The whole argument of the affirmative assumes that people who are poor or who have had few educational advantages are inferior and undesirable. The fact is that predatory wealth is

infinitely more dangerous to our institutions than poor immigrants can ever be.

The clothing business, especially in New York and Philadelphia, is entirely dominated by immigrants. They are gradually taking the cotton and woolen mills, mining, furniture and leather making. In some cases their work is preferred, and in all cases it is cheaper.

Only the poorest paid labor of Europe has been coming to the United States for several years. While we were getting the best blood of Europe we might welcome it, but very little of what is coming now can ever become American. What possible excuse for admitting it, then.

Can't we risk something to continue the glorious service to humanity which we have been rendering by our immigration for the last one hundred years? No individual or people ever trod the upward path without finding lions in the way, which have proved stone to those who go ahead.

Richard T. Ely, professor of Political Economy in University of Wisconsin, says that these southern Europeans have shown an unfortunate tendency to linger in the cities of the eastern seaboard, swarming in the slums, and intensifying all those social evils which have their origin in urban congestion.

"In this period of reconstruction there is the economic problem. It is apparent we cannot assimilate large numbers of foreigners; we cannot even give them employment; we cannot admit them without injuring our welfare, lowering our standards of living, and allowing them to compete unfairly with our workers."

Many college professors and instructors in other schools are foren-born. Many of the best merchants and bankers in the nation have come from some foren country. Woodrow Wilson is the son of a foren-born mother, and Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes is the son of a father and mother from Wales.

Because they are lower in the social scale, the new or present day immigrants are less easily assimilated than the old immigrants. They fail to comprehend American institutions and are illiterate to an alarming extent. More than one and a half million of our foren-born population, or 12.7 per cent, can neither read nor write.

The present Immigration laws of the United States are admirable for the protection of the United States against those

who are physically and mentally defective, as well as against all objectionable classes and conditions. Those who have not studied the existing laws know but little regarding their breadth and character.

It is a very significant fact that three presidents, Cleveland, Taft, and Wilson, have vetoed bills restricting immigration. They were not as much afraid of the labor vote as senators and congressmen. They represented the country as a whole instead of a single state or district and naturally took a broader view of the problem.

At first the only regulation of immigration was by the states. Conditions differ so in different states that it is still difficult for Congress to pass laws that deal with equal justice with all the states. Asiatic immigration on the western coast, for example, requires different treatment from European immigration on the eastern coast.

The stoppage of immigration for two years would create so much hardship and mental anguish by separating members of families, by keeping an immigrant citizen from sending for an otherwise admissible wife, parent, grandparent, unmarried or widowed daughter, or sister, etc., only the most alarming situation could justify such action.

We took this land from the Indians because they were not cultivating it all. We should take our own medicine. There are millions of acres not yet under cultivation which millions in Europe, now suffering grinding poverty, would be overjoyed to cultivate. What the old song said, is still true:

"Uncle Sam is rich enough to give us all a farm".

The first immigration act, 1864, was designed to encourage immigration. It offered immigrants freedom from compulsory military service, and the assistance of a Commissioner of Immigration to protect them from impositions and aid them in getting settled. This act was repealed four years later and no further efforts have been made to encourage immigration.

The chief opposition to restriction of immigration comes from the employers of labor, who wish competition to reduce wages so they may increase their profits. They are willing to endanger if not sacrifice the integrity of our institutions, the character of the American people and all that they mean to humanity in order that they may employ labor a little cheaper.

Many foreigners do not remain in cities, but go to the farms. "For New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, 31 per cent.

Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin, 32 per cent; Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Montana, Idaho, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Nevada, 40 per cent; Washington, Oregon, and California, 42 per cent."

The Immigrant becoming an American, seeking American opportunities, becomes filled with the spirit of looking for better things; he is progressive or he would not trouble himself to come to America. He becomes a good citizen when he is given an opportunity, is generally law abiding, and there is a smaller percentage of divorces among them than among the native born.

"Foreners returning home for various reasons at the present time are taking back with them approximately \$2,000,000,000 according to statements secured from bankers by the Inter-Racial Council, says a writer in the New York Journal of Commerce. The total loss in savings taken out of the Country is estimated at a minimum of \$2,000 for each departing emigrant." (Lit. Digest).

"Such a measure as the Affirmative proposed is contrary to all American ideals and principles. It ignores all our experience in selecting and training our immigrants to become American citizens and ignores all our debt to the forener for the part he has played in building up our industries and developing our resources and says to one an all, good and bad alike, "Stay out—STAY OUT."

The distribution of immigrants to the different states must, of course, be done, chiefly at least, by the states themselves. While the western states were new and the character of the immigrants high they were brought west in great numbers. But since the character of the immigration has changed, placing immigrants on farms has almost ceased. They crowd into the eastern cities.

The Nation is not nearly developed. We have barely scratched the surface of possibilities. Our industries are young. Our nation is capable of supporting a population three or four times as large as at present. Millions of acres are in public domain. Many natural resources are still untouched. Present need is for more workmen to carry on this development, and the immigrant meets the need.

The chief demand for the further restriction of immigration comes from labor leaders who do not want the competition of

immigrant labor. They want it so that however lazy and inefficient American laborers may be they can still get the highest wages in the world. Almost without exception congressmen who vote for restriction of immigration are afraid of the labor vote in their districts.

"The Report of the Immigration Commission in 1910 states that, there is no town or city of industrial importance east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio and Potomac rivers, which does not have its immigrant colony. In these colonies they have remained, living in congested quarters, representing nations within a nation, separated from the true America by the prejudice of the natives."

America has been called the Melting Pot. While it has failed in many cases there are some wonderful successes. What nation ever had greater souls than Jacob Riis and Dr. Steiner. Few Americans rise to such heights of character. Immigration often furnishes material for the finest characters that live. It is the glory of our immigration that it produces such characters, and the world will be poorer if we stop it.

The new immigration policy, so far as it affects immigration from Europe, is based on the principle that time for free and unregulated immigration has passed. The immigration of the future from each separate people should depend on the capacity of that people, as shown by experience, to enter wholesomely into our life. America should admit from each land only so many immigrants as we can really Americanize.

For nearly a century America has been the hope of the oppressed and down-trodden of the whole earth. We have held the noblest and proudest position ever held by any people in the whole history of the world. This honor we have inherited from our fathers, and a glorious inheritance it is. Nothing but the most imperative necessity should make us even think of sacrificing such a heritage. Such a necessity does not exist.

Because a few foreners fail to become fully assimilated the affirmative denounce all. It is our own fault that assimilation is slow. The Americanization movement is a confession of our dereliction in this. We hold aloof from immigrants and then condemn them for huddling together. We refuse to do our plain duty to immigrants and inflict the punishment on them instead of on ourselves by refusing them admission to this country.

For a long time economic and political conditions had the effect of selecting good immigrants, those who could be easily

assimilated. Now just the reverse is the case. Immigration from England, Germany, and Sweden has practically ceased. Would be immigrants can do better at home than here. Only those are coming whose condition has become intolerable and hopeless. That kind cannot make and are not making their way.

A tremendous effort is being made to crush the labor unions. This is the openly avowed policy of many large business organizations. The most tremendous weapon they could possibly use would be unrestricted immigration. If they could only fill the country with hungry immigrants to work for anything and compelled to take what they could get, it would be manifestly impossible for the unions to keep wages up to an American standard.

The object of the immigrant in coming to America is not commendable. At best he comes with a selfish motive. He is seeking his benefit not our national welfare. Often he comes to try out some new social theory or other idea which would not be tolerated in his home land. He uses the cloak of our popular government to shield his real motives. Black-hand organizations and anarchists are, almost without exception, of foren-born parentage.

Thousands who fought in our army in Europe are now refused the privilege of bringing relatives from Europe. Thousands who were crippled and maimed in our service are condemned by us never to see their loved ones again because we refuse them admission. Nearest relatives of thousands who made the supreme sacrifice for our flag are now refused its protection. Such facts cry to heaven. Have we no conscience; no sense of justice at all?

There would be little objection to an immigration system that selected immigrants so that we got only the best. If more careful selection were the method of restriction there would be less objection. But we do not select. The immigrant that first gets to quarantine is admitted. If he fail to get there first he is rejected, whatever his qualities. His merits are not even considered. He is admitted by luck. Yet the affirmative wish to make it worse.

The K. K. K. demands 100% Americanism. That would stop most of our immigration. Yet America means far more to many intelligent immigrants than to most of the native born. In one Polish family represented in the University of Okla-

homa, two daughters resigned stenographic positions and went home and ran the farm, doing all the farm work, while the three sons enlisted in our army. Thousands of our bravest soldiers were immigrants.

W.J. Lauck says that, "during the past six months (1921), there has been a steady growth of immigration which has overtaxed the Government's facilities for handling new arrivals." In the Review of Reviews, Dec. 1920. . . . he tells us. . . . that Ellis Island is unable to cope with the situation; that 1300 women and children are packed in a room intended for but 250. He also adds that ships lie in the harbor days at a time waiting to discharge their passengers.

The Great Master said, "He that saveth his life shall lose it". We are being told that we must save our national life by the practise of a selfishness and brutality unparalleled in human history. For no great nation ever proposed such a policy as that advocated by the affirmative. Citizenship in any nation was never so sought for before. Even if the alleged purpose to serve our nation was not a hollow pretense, it is negated by human experience and by the teachings of the Christ.

Outlook, March 8, 1922. Opposition to the new Immigration Act has come from those who declare that, despite general conditions of unemployment, there is a scarcity of farm labor, and also of unskilled labor necessary in housing, railway and road construction; moreover that it is inhumane in certain of its exclusive provisions and contrary to the highest American ideals and traditions as well as to economic efficiency, since it regulates immigration by standards not of **quality** but of **QUANTITY**.

It would be utterly impossible for us to manufacture for export without immigrant labor. This is the reason, and a good reason, why manufacturers oppose further restriction of immigration. It is well known that Americans will not work for as low wages as immigrants, and yet the latter get more than they did in Europe. The affirmative are really demanding the destruction of our export trade in manufactures. That is one of the reasons why three presidents have vetoed immigrant restriction bills.

Dec. 13, 1920, the House passed a bill almost prohibiting immigration by a vote of 295 to 41. The Senate amended it by adding the 30% provision. It finally became a law May 19, 1921. On May 11, 1922, the act took effect extending the Act of 1921 to June 30, 1924, with a few additions:—Immigrants coming from Mex-

ico, Cuba, and Canada must have lived there 5 years; steamships are fined \$200 for exceeding the quota; and are required to refund the money paid for passage by those who are refused admission.

Who made it 3%? What magic in that amount? It is purely arbitrary, artificial. And so would 2%, or 1% or any other percent. It is irrational, inequitable, unjustifiable. At Ellis Island, recently, they let in one half of a man one month and the other half the next. The quota for a month is often exhausted in a few hours, and whole ship loads have to wait till the next month. Their getting in then is a matter of luck merely. Such methods are a disgrace to any country. But the affirmative wish to make it worse.

The institutions of a people can never be better than the people who make them; they are the product of the people. We used to get immigration from the north of Europe which was equal to our own people; but now immigration is coming from peoples who were never our equals and never can be. We cannot lower the character of our people without lowering our institutions. We have not the heart to do our full duty to our institutions or to our children; but we should certainly limit undesirable immigration as much as possible.

Mr. William H. Barr, president of the Interracial Council, says: "No other Country is so profoundly interested in the problem of immigration as is the United States. Its industry and economic history is, in effect, a history of its immigration. There are in the country today sixteen million foreign born people, and they are the parents of more than twenty million American born children. Insofar as our national development depends upon the labor of our people, one-third of the progress is due to the immigrant and his family."

We have already begun the policy of admitting immigrants. We cannot abandon it now without inflicting incredible suffering upon thousands whose only offense is that they love America enough to wish to make their home here. Every day our nation is committing crimes worse than murder upon helpless immigrants who land upon our shores; crimes which measured by the dreadful suffering they entail have never been surpassed in the history of the human race. Our America is doing this, and the affirmative ask us to do still worse!

All the arguments for restriction of immigration are based on the fact that most of it crowds to the eastern cities where

is not needed. But this is no argument for national restriction. All that is needed is restriction from a few eastern cities. Immigrants would far rather go where they were needed if they were needed if they could only get there. All this clamor for restriction simply means that we should provide better means of distribution so that immigrants could get where they are needed and wanted, instead of being crowded into a few eastern cities.

The English sparrow is an apt illustration of the effect of immigration. It was first introduced into New England to attack tree worms; but it has driven out so many of the other birds which ate worms that they have done far more harm than good. Parallel with this bird immigration has been the human immigration. In the great Lawrence strike a few years ago, out of 45,000 who struck only two were Americans; the immigrants had driven the rest out of New England. To favor immigration under present conditions is to antagonize our American stock.

The Immigration problem is an old one. It has been argued pro and con ever since this country was established. In 1765, Thomas Dongan in a letter to the King of England lamented the results of a great influx of immigrants into the Royal Province of New England. And then in 1817, over a hundred years ago, the Immigration Commission, in a report published in the *Niles Register*, states that immigrants are already too thick on the American maritime frontier. In that year only five thousand immigrants came to this country from all the countries of the world."

We are demanding a far higher average character and qualifications from immigrants than we ourselves have. We insist that they shall be almost saints, paragons of moral qualities, while we tolerate mobs, political rings and bosses, and many other evils among our own citizens which threaten our civilization far more than immigration does. By far the greatest enemies of our institutions are found among our own people; we cannot blame it on immigrants. Criminals cry "stop thief" to divert attention from themselves. Some are crying "stop immigration" for a similar reason.

Immigrants are accustomed to lower wages in Europe. When they land here with little or no money they are glad to work for anything rather than starve or use up their last penny. They cannot join unions yet; they are at a tremendous disadvantage

in seeking work. The fact is they are ruthlessly exploited by many employers of labor. Under such circumstances it is no wonder that they take jobs away from our American Workmen. The general effect is to lower wages. That this is actually done is beyond all controversy. It is significant, too, that the chief advocates of unrestricted immigration are the large employers of labor.

That we have become a great nation is due more to our geographical position than to our own wisdom and merit. America is a gift of Providence to us. Placed where no nation could attack except at immense disadvantage; endowd with varid climate and fertile lands incomparably rich and accessible we could hardly help being a desirable land. For more than a century we have recognized our obligation to the Divine Providence and have shared its beneficence with the down-trodden and opprest of other lands who have sought asylum here. Now is is proposed to reverse this policy and selfishly claim it all for ourselves.

We are doing practically nothing to direct and utilize immigration. And that is the whole trouble. We could assimilate even a very large Asiatic immigration if we made any intelligent effort to distribute it properly to where it is needed instead of allowing it to accumulate where it is a menace. Farmers need desperately thousands of European laborers and cannot get them. Life infinitely superior to the peasant life of Europe is waiting for millions who are powerless to reach it under present conditions. It is inhuman to restrict immigration to the vanishing point until we have done everything possible to utilize it, and we have done nothing at all.

Mr. John E. Otterson, president of the Winchester Repeating Arms Company, says: "Industry is suffering many unfortunate reactions growing out of the war, and perhaps not the least of these is the reaction growing out of the failure of immigration. I am informd that before the war we had about one and a quarter million immigrants per year coming into this Country and of this number about thirty per cent, or 240,000 were of the unskild laboring class. Since the war we have had about one-quarter million a year, and of this number 35% have been of the unskild class. As a result of this condition we are short between four and five millions in immigrant labor."

Our nearest neighbor, Canada, has found it necessary to restrict immigration, especially Japanese. As most of her immi

gration comes from the United States, their problem is quite different from ours. As a rule, Asiatics differ so greatly from the white races that they cannot be assimilated. They are accustomed to such modes of life, character of food, etc., that white labor cannot compete with them. They multiply so rapidly that they quickly replace the whites. They have become the same menace that we are meeting in California. All so fully agree that this immigration should be restricted that it is no longer debated, either in the United States or Canada.

Hon. Albert Johnson, (of Washington) says: "We should restrict immigration because we are saturated. We need a breathing spell. . . . Opportunity for immediate gain is the goal sought by so many immigrants, and in the present congestion of our cities, that opportunity is non-existent and discontent follows. . . . With more than 10,000,000 unassimilated aliens on hand, with a large part of the civilized world bankrupt and in a state of disorder which will continue for many years, with aliens pouring in 50,000 to 75,000 a month. "We the people of the United States" stand a chance of being assimilated before we can assimilate the mass."

The new Immigration Act is radical and far-reaching. The act itself comprises only a few hundred words. It provides that the number of aliens admitted annually from countries covered by this act shall not exceed 3% of the number from those countries already in the United States in 1910. Not only is immigration being kept within reasonable limits by the New Act, which became a law on May 19, 1921, but the percentage of immigrants reaching this Country from northern and western Europe has been increased greatly by its workings, as compared with the percentage under the unrestricted plan in vogue in 1913. —Digest of statement of Walter W. Husband, Commissioner-General of Immigration.

Japanese immigration presents a peculiarly difficult problem. They are undoubtedly thrifty, energetic and capable. The Japanese people have made such wonderful progress in the last fifty years that no one can deny their equality in many ways to the white civilization. Their territory is so limited and they are increasing so fast that it is impossible for them to remain within their former boundaries. The western coast of North America has climatic conditions nearest like Japan. Without restriction they would be certain soon practically to take that country from the whites by peaceable economic invasion. Thus far the Japan-

we have restricted immigration to Japan far more than we have restricted Japanese immigration to America, and there seems no good reason why we should not adopt equal restrictions.

The chief problem of Chinese immigration is that most of it is the coolie labor type; we cannot get very much of the desirable classes. It is only in recent years that the nobility of the Chinese character has been generally recognized. Since the Boxer rebellion so many Chinese are being educated in the United States that we are exercising a very great influence on the thinking classes of China. Chinese immigration is chiefly a labor problem, and as such it is, for the present, at least, apparently insoluble. Restriction is no longer debatable. Very few voices indeed are heard in defense of unrestricted Asiatic immigration, so that does not properly enter into this debate; but the necessity of further restriction, however, is debatable, as many urge that Asiatic immigration should be entirely prohibited.

We have an undoubted right to select from those who desire to come to our shores. We have every right to reject those who would be an injury or a public burden. But we do not do this. We reject the bad and good alike. We restrict only by luck and an arbitrary 3%, and the affirmative wish to make it 2% or less.

The affirmative claim that we cannot assimilate any more immigrants. So far as there is any truth whatever in that statement, it is our fault not the immigrants'. We allow immigration agents to lie to them and get them over here; then we herd them together into the slums; we permit them to be exploited outrageously; we refuse them our fellowship; we provide them little or no education till they have learned English; and now the affirmative are urging that they should be punished by further restriction; punished for our cruelty and neglect. The affirmative have gall, to say the least.

The Affirmative claim that poor and ignorant immigrants are used by corrupt politicians especially in our cities. It would be far better to banish the corrupt politicians than the immigrants.

Dr. Edward A. Steiner tells the following story:

"One evening at Odessa after a hard days work I went in a gondola out on the sea to enjoy the cool air and get a little rest. Soon I saw a great many boats following us. When we were nearly surrounded I asked my boatman to tell them that I would give them all that I had without their killing me. 'They don't wish to kill ye', said he, 'they only wish to have you talk to them about America'. I got up on the seat and began talking to them

Soon I saw a man climbing into my boat and crawling towards me. I stopt speaking and said, 'What do you want?' The crowd was so angry at his stopping my speech that they were about to attack him, when he cried, 'I didn't want to hurt you, sir; I only wanted to kiss the feet that had stood on the soil of America!'

It is to such people that the affirmative would close the door of hope!

Migration has played an immensely important part in human progress. The emigration of Abraham was the beginning of a very great era in the development of humanity. Restricted immigration would have kept him at home. Migration to Egypt saved Israel from starvation, and trained them in the ways of the world's greatest civilization at that time. It was the Dorian migration that gave the world ancient Greece. It was the Norse migrations that gave us Europe, whose history until very recently has been the history of civilization. To stop migration is to fatally interfere with the working of the natural laws of human progress. One of the surest causes of degeneration is "inbreeding". A nation which excludes foren blood perishes as miserably as grains or stock shut up to inbreeding in the same way. It was a lesson which even the royal families of Europe had to learn and to practise to save their thrones from imbeciles. Migration has been the most tremendous stimulus in the whole history of human development. We need far better reasons than yet appear before we are justified in preventing it. Of course we should guide and regulate it; but that favors rather than hinders it.

It has long been our boast and our glory that we have no peasantry here in these United States. While many immigrants come here as peasants they do not remain peasants but become like the rest of our people. The rich find it hard to get servants in this country, and they would like so to increase immigration that they could have servants as they do in Europe and Asia. This might be convenient for the idle rich but it is not American. It is treason to all that Americanism has ever meant.

Immigrants are indispensable to us. They are now doing

Two-thirds of our coal mining;

Three-fourths of the labor in woolen mills;

Nine-tenths of the labor in cotton mills;

They are making more than ninety-ninths of our clothes.

More than half of our shoes;

Four-fifths of our furniture;

Four-fifths of our leather.

It is claimed that we have millions of acres of unimproved land and that we need all the immigrants we can get in order

to improve it but that all the present immigration goes to the cities where it is not needed and refuses to engage in agriculture. But how can immigrants buy farms, stock them, and live for several years till they begin to be productive? Why exclude them for not doing the utterly impossible?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Periodicals

Annals American Academy. 39 & Woodland Ave.,
Philadelphia, Pa. 85c.

Vol.

- 61:30-9; Sept. '15. War and Immigration. Frank J. Warne.
93:134-8; Jan. '21. Americanization, Carol Aronovici.
93:139-44; Jan. '21. The Oppression Psychosis and the Immigrant. H. A. Miller.
93:144-9; Jan. '21. Immigration the Matrix of American Democracy. A. T. Burns.
93:153-6; Jan. '21. The Polish Group in the United States. J. K. Grove.
93:185-90; Jan. '21. The Industrial Significance of Immigration.
93:198-201; Jan. '21. The Ultimate basis of Immigration. H. P. Fairchild.
93:190-3; Jan. '21. Immigration and the World War. Prescott F. Hall.
93:201-11; Jan. '21. Immigration and the Future. Frances A. Kellor.
93:211-24; Jan. '21. The New Flood Tide of Immigration, etc. H. W. Jessup.
Each Team should have Volume 93. January, 1921.
Atlantic Monthly. 8 Arlington, Boston, Mass. 50c.
127:40-3; Jan. '21. What is the Reason. S. M. Bouton.
127:484-7; Apr. '21. Reason. A Reply to the Above. D. C. Barnhouse.
129:764-8; Jun. '22. Deeper Misgivings. G. Speranza.

Catholic World. New York City.

110:591-600; Feb. '20. Beneficent America.

Century Magazine. Century Co., New York. 50c.

102:131-5; May '21. Menace of Migrating Peoples. Edward A. Ross.

Collier's. 416, W13, New York City. 10c.

69:9-10; May 6, '22. Close the Gates. George Creel.

70:3-4; July 1, '22. What's the Matter with America. Wm. Allen White.

Current History Magazine. New York Times Co. N. Y. 35c.

12:704-6; July '20. The New Tide of Immigration.

13, Part 2:405-8; Mar. '21. A Constructive Immigration Policy. Wm. H. Barr.

14:600-5; July '21. Important Facts Regarding Recent Immigration. D. C. Brewer.

15:204-9; Jan. '22. How Restricted Immigration Works out. W. W. Husband.

16:115-7; Apr. '22. Our Immigration Problem. Etta V. Leighton.

Current Opinion. Current Opinion Bldg. New York City. 35c.

69:176-80; Aug. '20. Does America want Immigration or Emigration? T. C. DuPont.

70:458-62; Apr. '21. Canadian and American Melting Pots. A. C. Laut.

- Educational Review.** Doubleday, Page & Co.
Garden City, N. Y. 35c.
63:67-70; Jan. '22. America's Making. W. C. Smith.
The Forum Magazine. Cooperstown, N. Y. 35c.
64:58-69; July '20. Fair Play for the Foren Born. A. Woods.
64:441-8; Dec. '20. Better Treatment for the Immigrant. T. C. DuPont.
65:68-76; Jan. '21. Immigration Hysteria in Congress. J. E. Mulholland.
Good Housekeeping. 119, W 40, New York. 25c.
70:20-1; June '20. An Immigrant Speaks. A. Yezierska.
Harper's Magazine. Franklin Square, New York City. 50c.
144:490-8; Mar. '22. Teacher and the Taught. G. Irwin.
144:505-14; Mar. '22. Three Per Cent, etc. V. I. Paradise.
The Independent. 311, 6th Ave., N. York. 15c.
100:372-3; Dec. 27, '19. Our Common Interest. G. de Michelis.
102:201; Aug. '21. If You were an Immigrant. A. Sapelli.
American Journal of Sociology. University of Chicago Press.
27:71-85; July '21. Significance of Immigration in Amer. Hist.
A. Schlessinger.

- Monthly Labor Review.** Bureau Labor Statistics,
Washington, D. C. 25c.
12:697-9; Mar. '21. Immigration.
13:222-6; July '21. The New Immigration Law.
Literary Digest. Funk & Wagnalls, New York City. 10c.
48:7-8; Feb. 26, '21. Inviting Immigration from N. W. Europe.
65:12-3; Apr. 24, '20. America Short four million workers.
65:32; June 5, '20. Immigrants Coming again.
65:48-51; Jun. 19, '20. What Some Homebound Emigrants think
of America.
65:132; May 8, '20. Immigrants Leaving with Tremendous
Wealth.
66:18; Sept. 11, '20. Decreasing Fear of Immigration.
67:7-9; Dec. 18, '20. Theoretical Inundation from Europe.
67:14-5; Dec. 25, '20. To Halt European Invasion.
67:16-7; Nov. 6, '20. To Divert Immigrants to Farms.
68:42; Jan. 29, '21. Immigration.
69:12-3; May 7, '21. Alien Anti-dumping Bill.
69:19-20. Foren Language Press on Immigration.
74:1; July 1, '22. An Evaporating Menace.
New Republic. 421, W. 21st, New York City. 15c.
22:314-6; May 5, '21. Our Step Children. S. Toksvi.
30:52-3; Mar. 8, '22. Tragedy of the Excess Quota. E. Abbott.
North American Review. 9, E. 37th, New York. 40c.
213:598-607; May '21. Present and Future of Immigration
Prescott Hall.
214:13-20; July '21. Future Immigration. F. Kellor.
215:145-54; Feb. '22. Throwing away Our Birthright. W. R.
Thayer.
Outlook. 381, 4th Ave., N. Y. 15c.
125:682-3; Aug. 18, '20. Who Is Responsible. G. S. Burns.

126:753-5; Dec. 29, '20. The Incomparable Migration. Harold Knutson.

129:523-24; Nov. 30, '21. Greenhorn at the Gate. N. DeBogery

131:256-60; June 7, '22. Immigration and Naturalization. J. J. Davis.

Review of Reviews. 30 Irving Place, N. Y. City. 35c.

62:618-24; Dec. '20. The New Immigration. W. J. Lauck.

65:509-16; Jan. 28, '22. How Immigration Laws are Working. J. J. Davis.

Saturday Evening Post. Curtis Pub. Co., Philadelphia, Pa. 5c.

192:3-4; Feb. 14, '20. Rising Irish Tide. K. L. Roberts.

192:8; Feb. 28, '20. Immigration Control. A. W. Parker.

193:101-; Aug. 21, '20. Guests from Italy. K. L. Roberts.

194:11; Jan. 28, '22. Shutting the Sea Gates. K. L. Roberts.

193:3-4; Apr. 30, '21. Existence of an Emergency. K. L. Roberts.

Science. Garrison, N. Y. 15c.

53:151-3; Feb. 18, '21. Anthropology and Immigration. A. E. Jenks.

Scientific American. Munn & Co. N. Y. 15c.

122:231; Mar. 6, '20. A Year's Supply of Raw Materials for Melting Pot. R. Howard.

Scribners' Magazine. Charles Scribners' Sons, N. Y. 50c.

71:157-62; Feb. '22. America and I. A. Yezierska.

72:26-8; July '22. The Elusive American and ex-European. E. Boyd.

Survey. Survey Associates Inc. 112, E. 19th. N. Y. 25c.

43:258-9; Dec. '20. Strength of America. S. J. Lubin and C. Krysto.

See also Feb. 7, '20; Mar. 6, '20.

43:461-3; Jan. 24, '20. Struggle of America, etc. S. J. Lubin and C. Krysto.

43:450-1; Feb. 7, '20. Alien Impressions of America. A French.

44:107-8; Apr. 17, '20. Immigrant Savings. P. M. Warburg.

45:834-5; Mar. 5, '21. Three Per Cent Immigration.

47:815-21; Feb. 25, '22. Americans by Choice. J. P. Gavit.

47:957-8; Mar. 18, '22. The First Chapter. M. C. Calkins.

48:156-61; Apr. 29, '22. Red, White, and Blue Tape. P. L. Ellerbe.

Apr. 15, '22. Bibliography.

World's Work. Doubleday, Page & Co. Garden City, N. Y. 25c.

41:201-3; Dec. '20. Is America American? Lothrop Stoddard.

41:328-40; Feb. 21, '21. Moratorium in Immigration. Ed.

Books and Pamphlets

Antin, Mary. They who knock at our gates; a complete gospel of immigration. Houghton, Mifflin Co. Boston. 1914.

Abbott, Grace. The immigrant and the community. Century. New York. 1914.

Commons, John R. Races and immigrants in America. New Ed. Macmillan. 1920.

Congressional Record. Vol. 60. 0. 9-11, 13, '20. Immigration Debate by Albert Johnson of Washington and others.

- Davis, Philip, and Schwartz, Bertha, comps. *Immigration and Americanization; selected readings*. Ginn & Co., Boston, 1920.
- Fairchild, Henry P. *Immigration, a world movement and its American significance*. Macmillan. New York. 1913.
- Foerster, Robert F. *Italian emigration of our times*. Harvard Univ. Press. Cambridge. 1919.
- Gulick, Sidney L. *Permanent immigration policy*, 8p. National Committee for Constructive Immigration Legislation. New York. 1921.
- Hall, Prescott F. *Immigration and its effects upon the United States*. Henry Holt & Co. New York. 1913. Chaps. VII. VIII. IX.
- Haskin, Frederic J. *The immigrant, an asset and a liability*. Fleming H. Revell & Co. New York. 1913.
- Hourwich, Isaac A. *Immigration and labor; the economic aspect of European immigration to the United States*. Putnam. New York. 1912.
- Jenks, Jeremiah W., and Lauck, W. Jett. *Immigration problem; a study of American immigration conditions and needs*. 4th ed, rev. & enl. Funk & Wagnalls. New York. 1917. Chaps. X. XI.
- Kellor, Frances. *Immigration and the future*. Doran. New York 1920.
- Phelps, Edith M., comp. *Selected articles on immigration*. (Handbook Series). H. W. Wilson Co. New York. 1921.
- Rihbany, Abraham M. *A far journey*. Houghton, Mifflin Co. (Boston). 1914.
- Roberts, Peter. *The new immigration; a study of the industrial and social life of southeastern Europeans in America*. Macmillan. New York. 1912.
- Ross, Edward A. *Old world in the new; the significance of past and present immigration to the American people*. Century. New York. 1914.
- Shriver, William P. *Immigrant forces; factors in the new democracy*. Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada. New York. 1913.
- Sisson, Francis H. *Constructive immigration policy*. 8p. Guaranty Trust Co. New York, 1921.
- Steiner, Edward A. *Nationalizing America*. Fleming H. Revell Co. New York. 1916.
- Steiner, Edward A. *The immigrant tide; its ebb and flow*. Fleming H. Revell Co. New York. 1909.
- United States. Department of Labor. Bureau of Immigration. *Immigration laws (act of February 5, 1917); rules of May 1, 1917*. (fourth edition, Feb. 1920.) 108 p. Tables and map. 1920.
- United States. House of Representatives. Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. *Emergency immigration legislation; hearing before the committee on H. R. 14461*. (66th Congress, 3d Session). 718p. Apply to Congressman.

United States. House of Representatives. Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. Proposed restriction of immigration: Hearings on H. R. 12320, April 20, 1920: (66th Congress, 2nd Session) 138 p. 1921. Apply to Congressman.

United States. Immigration commission. Abstracts of reports. 2v. Gov't. Prtg. Office, 1911.

United States. Library of Congress. Brief list of references on immigration. 5p. Typew. 35c. Dec. 13, 1920. (Obtainable thru Public Affairs Information Service, 11 W. 40th St., New York.)

Warne, Frank T. The tide of immigration. D. Appleton & Co. New York. 1916.

Welty, B. F. The regulation of immigration. National Committee for Constructive Immigration Legislation. New York, 1920.

Literature can also be secured from:

Immigration Restriction League, 11 Pemberton Square, Boston 9, Mass.

Inter-Racial Council, Woolworth Building, N. Y.

National Committee for Constructive Immigration Legislation, 105 E. 22d St., New York.

CONTENTS

Introduction	2
Text of the New Immigration Law.....	3
Human Factors in the Immigration Problem, Viola I.	
Paradise	8
Threatened Inundation from Europe.....	22
Throwing Away Our Birthright—W. R. Thayer.....	29
A Constructive Immigration—Wm. H. Barr.....	37
Immigration and Naturalization—J. J. Davis.....	42
Our Immigration Problem—Etta V. Leighton.....	50
Immigration Hysteria in Congress—J. E. Milholland.....	54
For Restriction—J. V. McClintic.....	60
The Incomparable Migration—Harold Knutson.....	63
Distribution vs. Restriction—A. B. Rossdale.....	67
The Menace of Migrating Peoples—Edward A. Ross.....	71
Anthropology and Immigration—A. E. Jenks.....	76
Minority Report, House Immigration Committee.....	79
Digests of Various Articles.....	87
Bibliography	101

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA



3 1262 07424 191 9

325.73
S 435r

114876

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA BULLETIN

The University Bulletin has been established by the university. The reasons that have led to such a step are: first, to provide a means to set before the people of Oklahoma, from time to time, information about the work of the different departments of the university; and second, to provide a way for the publishing of reports, papers, theses, and such other matter as the university believes would be helpful to the cause of education in our state. The Bulletin will be sent post free to all who apply for it. The university desires especially to exchange with other schools and colleges for similar publications:

Communications should be addressed:

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
University Hall
Norman, Oklahoma

University of Oklahoma Bulletin, published by the university, is issued semi-monthly. Entered at the postoffice at Norman, as second class matter, under act of congress of August 24, 1912. Accepted for mailing at special rate of postage, as provided for in Section 1103, act of October 3rd, 1917, authorized on July 8th, 1918.

THE UNIVERSITY PRESS